



A-489-856
Investigation
Public Version
TRCI: Team

December 29, 2025

**ENFORCEMENT AND COMPLIANCE
TRADE REMEDY COUNSELING AND INITIATIONS
ANTIDUMPING DUTY INVESTIGATION INITIATION CHECKLIST**

SUBJECT: Chromium Trioxide from the Republic of Türkiye
CASE NUMBER: A-489-856

THE PETITIONER:

American Chrome & Chemicals, Inc.
 4000 Town Center Blvd Ste 320
 Canonsburg, PA 15317

LEAD COUNSEL TO THE PETITIONER:

Nithya Nagarajan
 Husch Blackwell
 1801 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, Suite 1000
 Washington, DC 20006
 (202) 378-2409

SCOPE: *See* Attachment I – Scope of the Investigation, to this checklist.

APPROXIMATE CASE CALENDAR:

As explained in the Memorandum from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, performing the non-exclusive functions and duties of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, due to the lapse in appropriations and Federal Government shutdown, on November 14, 2025, the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) tolled all deadlines in administrative proceedings by 47 days.¹ Additionally, due to a backlog of documents that were electronically filed via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS) during the Federal

¹ See Memorandum, “Deadlines Affected by the Shutdown of the Federal Government,” dated November 14, 2025.

Government shutdown, on November 24, 2025, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative proceedings by an additional 21 days.² Therefore, the initiation date for this investigation is now December 29, 2025³ and all other deadlines have been adjusted accordingly.

Event	No. of Days	Date of Action	Day of Week
Antidumping Duty Investigation			
Petition Filed	0	September 29, 2025	Monday
Initiation Date	88	December 29, 2025	Monday*
ITC Preliminary Determination	92	December 30, 2025	Tuesday
ITA Preliminary Determination†**	231	May 18, 2026	Monday
ITA Final Determination†	306	August 3, 2026	Monday*
ITC Final Determination***	353	September 17, 2026	Thursday
Publication of Order****	360	September 24, 2026	Thursday

*Where the deadline falls on a weekend/holiday, the appropriate date is the next business day.

† These deadlines may be extended under the governing statute.

** This will take place only in the event of a preliminary affirmative determination from the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC).

*** This will take place only in the event of a final affirmative determination from the International Trade Administration (ITA).

**** This will take place only in the event of a final affirmative determination from the ITA and the ITC.

Note: The ITC final determination will take place no later than 45 days after a final affirmative ITA determination.

Note: Publication of order will take place approximately seven days after an affirmative ITC final determination.

INDUSTRY SUPPORT:

Does the Petition⁴ identify the entire domestic industry, including the names, addresses, and phone numbers of the petitioner and all domestic producers known to the petitioner?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

² See Memorandum, “Tolling of all Case Deadlines,” dated November 24, 2025.

³ See Executive Order on Providing for the Closing of Executive Departments and Agencies of the Federal Government on December 24, 2025, and December 26, 2025, dated December 18, 2025

(<https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/12/providing-for-the-closure-of-executive-departments-and-agencies-of-the-federal-government-on-december-24-2025-and-december-26-2025/>).

⁴ See Petitioner’s Letter, “Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties,” dated September 29, 2025 (Petition).

Does the Petition contain information relating to the degree of industry support for the Petition, including:

The total volume or value of U.S. production of the domestic like product for the most recently completed calendar year?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

The volume or value of the domestic like product produced by the petitioner and each domestic producer identified for the most recently completed calendar year?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

Do the petitioner and those expressing support for the Petition account for more than 50% of production of the domestic like product?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No

If No, do those expressing support account for the majority of those expressing an opinion and at least 25% of domestic production?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable

Was there opposition to the Petition from any producers or workers engaged in the production of the domestic like product?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No

Are any of the parties who have expressed opposition to the Petition either importers or domestic producers affiliated with foreign producers?

<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes
<input type="checkbox"/>	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not Applicable

For a detailed analysis of industry support, *see* Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Chromium Trioxide from India and the Republic of Türkiye, to this checklist.

INJURY ALLEGATION:

The ITC's notice of institution of antidumping and countervailing duty investigations was published in the *Federal Register* on October 2, 2025. The notice indicates that the ITC instituted investigations to determine whether there is a reasonable indication that the domestic industry producing chromium trioxide is materially injured, or threatened with material injury, by reason of imports of chromium trioxide from the Republic of Türkiye (Türkiye).⁵

For analysis of the injury allegation and information relevant to material injury, threat of material injury, or material retardation, and causation, including information on the volume of imports, the effect of these imports on prices in the U.S. market, and the consequent impact of imports on the domestic industry, *see* Attachment III, Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Chromium Trioxide from India and the Republic of Türkiye, to this checklist.

PETITION REQUIREMENTS:

Does the Petition contain the following?

- a clear and detailed description of the merchandise to be investigated, including the appropriate Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings (*see* Petition at Volume I at 4-11 and Exhibits GEN-1 and GEN-3 through GEN-10; *see also* General Issues Supplement⁶ at 2-4 and Exhibit Supp GEN-3).
- the name of each country in which the merchandise originates or from which the merchandise is exported (*see* Petition at Volume I at 11).
- the identity of each known exporter, foreign producer, and importer of the merchandise (*see* Petition at Volume I at 12-13 and Exhibits GEN-11, GEN-13, and GEN-15; *see also* General Issues Supplement at 1-2 and Exhibit GEN Supp-2).

⁵ See Chromium Trioxide from India and Turkey; Institution of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations and Scheduling of Preliminary Phase Investigations, 90 FR 47820 (October 2, 2025).

⁶ See Petitioner's Letter, "Response to General Issues Supplemental Questions," dated November 20, 2025 (General Issues Supplement).

- import volume and value information for the most recent two-year period (*see* Petition at Volume I at 13 and Exhibits GEN-1, GEN-16 through GEN-18; *see also* General Issues Supplement at 7).
- a statement indicating that the Petition was filed simultaneously with Commerce and the ITC (*see* cover letter to the Petition at 5).
- an adequate summary of the proprietary data (*see* public versions of the Petition, First Türkiye AD Supplement,⁷ and Second Türkiye AD Supplement⁸).
- a statement regarding release under administrative protective order (*see* the cover letters to the Petition at 1-5, First Türkiye AD Supplement at 1-3, and Second Türkiye AD Supplement at 1-3).
- a certification of the facts contained in Petition by an official of the petitioning firm(s) and its legal representative (if applicable) (*see* attachments to the cover letters to the Petition, General Issues Supplement, First Türkiye AD Supplement, and Second Türkiye AD Supplement).

LESS THAN FAIR VALUE ALLEGATION:

The Petition was officially filed on September 29, 2025. On November 14 and 24, 2025, Commerce issued supplemental questionnaires to the petitioner with respect to the less than fair value allegation. On November 19 and 26, 2025, the petitioner responded to Commerce's requests for information (First Türkiye AD Supplement and Second Türkiye AD Supplement). On December 9, 2025, Commerce spoke with the market researcher employed by the petitioner regarding information contained in the Foreign Market Research Declaration.⁹ In accordance with 19 CFR 351.204(b)(1), because the Petition was filed on September 29, 2025, the appropriate period of investigation (POI) is July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025.

U.S. Price

Information relevant to the U.S. price calculations can be found in Volume III of the Petition at 2-7 and Exhibits III-1 through III-11, First Türkiye AD Supplement at 2-8 and Exhibits Supp-III-1 through Supp-III-10 and Supp-III-13, and Second Türkiye AD Supplement at 1-5 and Exhibits 2Supp-III-1 through 2Supp-III-4.

⁷ *See* Petitioner's Letter, "Response to Supplemental Questions," dated November 19, 2025 (First Türkiye AD Supplement).

⁸ *See* Petitioner's Letter, "Response to Second Supplemental Questions," dated November 26, 2025 (Second Türkiye AD Supplement).

⁹ *See* Memorandum, "Telephone Call to Foreign Market Researcher Regarding Antidumping Petition," dated December 17, 2025 (Foreign Market Research Call Memorandum).

The petitioner calculated export price based on pricing information for chromium trioxide produced in Türkiye and offered for sale in the U.S. market during the proposed POI and made certain adjustments to price to calculate an ex-factory U.S. price in accordance with section 772 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). We examined the information provided by the petitioner and made no additional adjustments. The final net U.S. price is \$[]/kg.¹⁰

Does the Petition contain the following?

- supporting documentation for the alleged price(s) and any adjustments to the price(s) (*see* Petition at Volume III at 2-7 and Exhibits III-1 through III-11; *see also* First Türkiye AD Supplement at 2-8 and Exhibits Supp-III-6 through Supp-III-10 and Supp-III-13; and Second Türkiye AD Supplement at 1-5 and Exhibits 2Supp-III-1 through 2Supp-III-4).
- current price(s) (and adjustments to the price(s), if applicable) (*see* Petition at Volume III at 2-7 and Exhibits III-1 through III-11; *see also* First Türkiye AD Supplement at 2-8 and Exhibits Supp-III-6 through Supp-III-10 and Supp-III-13; and Second Türkiye AD Supplement at 1-5 and Exhibits 2Supp-III-1 through 2Supp-III-4).

N/A conversion factors for comparisons of differing units of measure

Normal Value

Information relevant to the normal value (NV) calculations can be found in Volume III of the Petition at 7-8 and Exhibits III-11 and III-12, First Türkiye AD Supplement at 8-9 and Exhibits Supp-III-11 through Supp-III-13, and Foreign Market Research Call Memorandum.

The petitioner based NV on a home market price quote obtained through a market researcher. Because the home market price quote was offered [

] to calculate an ex-factory home market price in accordance with section 773 of the Act. We examined the information provided by the petitioner and made no additional adjustments. The final net home market price is \$[]/kg.¹¹

Does the Petition contain the following?

- supporting documentation for the alleged price(s) and any adjustments to the price(s) (*see* Petition at Volume III at 7-8 and Exhibits III-11 and III-12; *see also* First Türkiye AD Supplement at 8-9 and Exhibits Supp-III-11 and Supp-III-12; and Foreign Market Research Call Memorandum).
- current price(s) (and adjustments to the price(s), if applicable) (*see* Petition at Volume III at 7-8 and Exhibits III-11 and III-12; *see also* First Türkiye AD

¹⁰ *See* First Türkiye AD Supplement at Exhibit Supp-III-13.

¹¹ *Id.*

Supplement at 8-9 and Exhibits Supp-III-11 through Supp-III-13; and Foreign Market Research Call Memorandum).

- correct currency rates used for all conversions to U.S. dollars (*see* Petition at Volume III at Exhibit III-12; *see also* First Türkiye AD Supplement at 8).
- N/A conversion factors for comparisons of differing units of measure

ESTIMATED MARGIN:

The petitioner provided a dumping margin based on a price-to-price comparison. The estimated dumping margin is 40.88 percent.¹²

RECOMMENDATION:

We examined the accuracy and adequacy of the evidence provided in the Petition as discussed in this checklist and attachments and recommend determining that the evidence is sufficient to justify the initiation of an antidumping duty investigation with regard to Türkiye. We also recommend determining that the Petition has been filed by, or on behalf of, the domestic industry.

ATTACHMENTS:

- I. Scope of the Investigation
- II. Analysis of Industry Support
- III. Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation

¹² *Id.*

Attachment I

Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise subject to this investigation is chromium trioxide (Chemical Abstracts Services (CAS) registry number 1333-82-0), regardless of form (dry or solution). Chromium trioxide is an inorganic compound with the molecular formula CrO₃ in dry form and H₂CrO₄ in solution form. All relevant formulas refer to same product with one unit of Chromium (as Cr+6) and three units of Oxygen, such as Cr₄O₁₂; and Cr_{0.25}O_{0.75}.

The product in dry form is generally referred to as chromium trioxide, which is the acidic anhydride of chromic acid. Chromium trioxide in solution form may be referred to as chromic acid. However, the dry form may also be marketed under the name chromic acid.

A non-exhaustive list of other names used for the subject merchandise includes: chromic anhydride, chromic trioxide, chromium (VI) oxide, monochromium trioxide, chromia, chromium (VI) trioxide, trioxochromium, and chromtrioxid. A non-exhaustive list of trade names for the subject merchandise includes: 11910080KROMSAV-ANHIDRID IP, Aktivkohle, imprägniert, Typ PLWK, Chromsäure, and Chroomzuur.

All chromium trioxide is covered by the scope of this investigation irrespective of purity, particle size, or physical form. Chromium trioxide is generally imported in dry form, including in the form of pellets, flakes, powders, or beads, but the scope includes chromium trioxide in solution form.

Chromium trioxide that has been blended with another product or products other than water is included in the scope if the resulting mix contains 90 percent or more of chromium trioxide by total formula weight, such as chromium trioxide mixed with a catalyst to make the product ready for use in metal finishing applications. If chromium trioxide is imported blended with another product, only the chromium trioxide content of the blend is included within the scope.

Subject merchandise also includes chromium trioxide that has been processed in a third country into a product that otherwise would be within the scope of this investigation, *i.e.*, if any such further processing would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the investigation it is included in the scope of the investigation, including blending, flaking, mixing with water, or packaging. For example, the dry form of the subject merchandise may be imported into a third country and then processed into solution before shipment to the United States. Such a solution would be subject to the scope.

The subject merchandise is provided for in subheading 2819.10.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). In addition to 1333-82-0, import documentation may also reflect CAS registry numbers 12324-05-9, 12324-08-2, and 1362947-20-3. Although the HTSUS subheading and CAS registry numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope is dispositive.

Attachment II

Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Chromium Trioxide from India and the Republic of Türkiye

I. Background

Sections 702(c)(4)(A) and 732(c)(4)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), state that the administering authority shall determine that a petition has been filed by or on behalf of the industry if the domestic producers or workers who support the petition account for: (1) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product; and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the petition.

Section 771(4)(A) of the Act defines the “industry” as the producers, as a whole, of a domestic like product, or those producers whose collective output of a domestic like product constitutes a major proportion of the total domestic production of the product. Thus, to determine whether a petition has the requisite industry support, the Act directs the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) to look to producers and workers who produce the domestic like product. The U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC), which is responsible for determining whether “the domestic industry” has been injured, must also determine what constitutes a domestic like product in order to define the industry. While both Commerce and the ITC must apply the same statutory definition regarding the domestic like product (section 771(10) of the Act), they do so for different purposes and pursuant to a separate and distinct authority. In addition, Commerce’s determination is subject to limitations of time and information. Although this may result in different definitions of the like product, such differences do not render the decision of either agency contrary to law.¹

Section 771(10) of the Act defines the domestic like product as “a product which is like, or in the absence of like, most similar in characteristics and uses with, the article subject to an investigation under this title.” Thus, the reference point from which the domestic like product analysis begins is “the article subject to an investigation,” *i.e.*, the class or kind of merchandise to be investigated, which normally will be the scope as defined in the Petitions.² While Commerce is not bound by the criteria³ used by the ITC to determine the domestic like product in answering this question, we have reviewed these factors as presented by the petitioner⁴ in the Petitions.⁵

¹ See *USEC, Inc. v. United States*, 132 F.Supp.2d 1, 8 (CIT 2001) (citing *Algoma Steel Corp. Ltd. v. United States*, 688 F. Supp. 639, 644 (CIT 1988), *aff'd* 865 F.2d 240 (Fed. Cir. 1989)).

² See Petitioner’s Letter, “Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties,” dated September 29, 2025 (Petitions). The petitioner filed “Response to General Issues Supplemental Questions,” dated November 20, 2025 (General Issues Supplement) in response to Commerce’s request for additional information regarding the Petitions.

³ See *Fujitsu Ltd. v. United States*, 36 F.Supp.2d 394, 397-98 (CIT 1999) (*Fujitsu*); see also *Torrington Co. v. United States*, 747 F.Supp. 744, 748-49 (CIT 1990), *aff'd*, 938 F.2d 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1991); and *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Handbook*, Fourteenth Edition, ITC Publication 4540 (June 2015) at II-34.

⁴ The petitioner is American Chrome & Chemicals, Inc. (the petitioner). See Petitions at Volume I (page 2 and Exhibits GEN-1 and GEN-2).

⁵ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 4-8, 14-18 and Exhibits GEN-1, GEN-3 through GEN-8, and GEN-19); see also General Issues Supplement at 10.

With respect to the domestic like product, the petitioner does not offer a definition of domestic like product distinct from the scope of the investigations.⁶ For a detailed analysis and discussion, *see* the “Analysis of Domestic Like Product” section below.

II. Analysis of Domestic Like Product

For support of its like product analysis, the petitioner addresses the six criteria used by the ITC to determine the domestic like product and contends that chromium trioxide constitutes a single like product.⁷ The petitioner makes the following arguments addressing these criteria:

1) *Physical Characteristics and Uses*

The petitioner notes that all chromium trioxide has similar physical characteristics, regardless of whether it is in dry form or solution form, and all chromium trioxide shares the same chemical composition.⁸ The petitioner explains that “{c}hromium trioxide is an inorganic compound with the molecular formula CrO₃ and Chemical Abstracts Services (CAS) registry number 1333-82-0.”⁹ Further, the petitioner notes that other valid CAS numbers under which chromium trioxide is found are 12324-05-9, 12324-08-2, and 1362947-20-3.¹⁰ The petitioner explains that “{c}hromium trioxide is produced in dry form but must be put into a solution with water before it can be used.”¹¹ The petitioner explains that it is only aware that subject merchandise has been imported in dry form, which would include flake and granular form.¹² The petitioner notes that about [] percent of their sales are in dry form, while the rest are solution form.¹³ The petitioner explains that “{s}olution is produced by mixing dry chromium trioxide with water and can be produced at whatever concentration the customer needs, such as 37.5%, 40%, 45%, 48%, or 50%.”¹⁴ The petitioner further explains that most often, the customer creates the solution form in their own facilities by adding water.¹⁵ The petitioner notes that “a few customers purchase the product already in solution form for reasons of safety and convenience.”¹⁶

The petitioner explains that generally importers will ship the product to the customer in dry form, but “in some cases an importer or their distributor create solution and ship it to certain customers.”¹⁷ The petitioner states that as it is more hazardous to ship corrosive liquid due to higher risk of containment failure, it is more common to transport the product in dry form.¹⁸

⁶ See Attachment I – Scope of the Investigation, to this Checklist; *see also* Petitions at Volume I (pages 4-11 and 14-20 and Exhibits GEN-1, GEN-3 through GEN-10, and GEN-19); *see also* General Issues Supplement at 2-4, 6-7, and Exhibit GEN Supp-3.

⁷ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 14-18 and Exhibit GEN-19); *see also* General Issues Supplement at 7.

⁸ See Petitions at Volume I (page 15).

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.*

¹³ *Id.*

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Id.* at 15-16.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 16.

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ *Id.*

The petitioner explains that dry chromium trioxide is sold priced in terms of dollars per kilogram, dollars per metric ton, or dollars per pound, while liquid chromium trioxide is priced in terms of dollars per liquid kilograms.¹⁹

The petitioner explains that chromium trioxide is primarily used “as a treatment in the preservation of wood, or as a surface treatment for a variety of metals.”²⁰ The petitioner adds that chromium trioxide provides a more attractive finish in treating wood “that is more resistant to weathering, staining, decay or fungal attack.”²¹ The petitioner states that chromium trioxide is a highly effective treatment on metal “that provides a more durable, corrosion-resistant oxide finish.”²² The petitioner adds that secondary applications for chromium trioxide “include catalyst manufacture, use as an oxidizing agent, glass and ceramic manufacture, and laboratory use.”²³

2) *Interchangeability*

The petitioner explains that “{a}ll chromium trioxide has the same chemical composition and serves the same uses.”²⁴ The petitioner states that while particle size and shape of dry chromium trioxide may vary the size and shape is irrelevant to customers, because “the product must be converted into a solution prior to use or application and therefore can only be used by the customer in solution form.”²⁵ The petitioner adds that particle size and shape may impact the time needed to dissolve the product in water; however, the time difference is a matter of seconds, and this difference is meaningless to customers.²⁶ The petitioner explains that the dry form of chromium trioxide “generally has a concentration that is approximately 99.5-99.8% chromium trioxide with the remainder consisting of impurities.”²⁷ The petitioner further explains that “any differences in impurity levels are minor and not sufficient to impact customer sourcing decisions.”²⁸ The petitioner concludes that there is “a high degree of substitutability among the domestic and foreign-sourced chromium trioxide.”²⁹

3) *Channels of Distribution*

The petitioner states that all forms of chromium trioxide are distributed in the same way.³⁰ The petitioner explains that “{t}he product is shipped directly to end users or sold to distributors, who in turn sell to end users, for all forms of chromium trioxide.”³¹

¹⁹ *Id.*

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ *Id.*

²² *Id.*

²³ *Id.*

²⁴ *Id.* at 17.

²⁵ *Id.*

²⁶ *Id.*

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ *Id.*

²⁹ *Id.*

³⁰ *Id.*

³¹ *Id.*

4) Customer and Producer Perceptions

The petitioner states that chromium trioxide powder and solution are generally interchangeable, with only minor variations between manufacturers.³² The petitioner explains that “{w}hile a few metal plating customers may prefer a particular version of the product, they could use chromium trioxide from any source given an attractive price.”³³ The petitioner explains that all chromium trioxide producers make a chemically identical product, sell to the same customers and in the same markets, and perceive all chromium trioxide to be interchangeable regardless of source.³⁴

5) Common Manufacturing Facilities, Processes, and Employees

The petitioner states that all chromium trioxide manufacturers are similar because they use identical manufacturing processes, similar raw materials, and comparable requirements for production employees.³⁵

6) Price

The petitioner explains that prices for chromium trioxide vary, primarily with respect to whether it is sold in powder or solution form.³⁶ The petitioner notes that it “typically sells dry chromium trioxide in the United States for approximately [] and typically sells solution for approximately [] on a dry basis.”³⁷ The petitioner explains that the solution form of chromium trioxide sells for a higher price because it requires more time and money to produce and it provides more value to the customer, who does not need to mix the solution themselves.³⁸ The petitioner clarifies that the cost of solution is still driven by the amount of dry chromium trioxide contained in the solution, thus the higher the percentage of dry chromium trioxide the greater the cost.³⁹ The petitioner states that customers choose which form of chromium trioxide to purchase based on their particular application needs.⁴⁰

III. Semifinished Like Product Analysis

The petitioner states that chromium trioxide in dry and solution form are also a single like product under the ITC’s semifinished product analysis.⁴¹ To support its argument, the petitioner uses the ITC’s semifinished product analysis⁴² and addresses the following five factors: (1) whether the upstream article is dedicated to the production of the downstream article or has independent uses; (2) whether there are perceived to be separate markets for the upstream and

³² *Id.*

³³ *Id.* 17-18.

³⁴ See General Issues Supplement (page 7).

³⁵ See Petitions at Volume I (page 18).

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ *Id.*

³⁸ *Id.*

³⁹ *Id.*

⁴⁰ *Id.*

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² See *Outboard Engines from Japan*, Inv. No. 731-TA-1069 (Final), USITC Pub. 3752 (February 2005) at pages 6-8; see also *Carbazole Violet Pigment 23 from China and India*, Inv. Nos. 701-TA-437 and 701-TA-1060 and 1061 (Final), USITC Pub. 3744 (December 2004) at 6-8.

downstream articles; (3) differences in the physical characteristics and functions of the upstream and downstream articles; (4) differences in the costs or value of the vertically differentiated articles; and (5) the significance and extent of the processes used to transform the upstream into the downstream articles.⁴³

- 1) *Whether the upstream article is dedicated to the production of the downstream article or has independent uses*

The petitioner states that dry chromium trioxide has no independent use and is only used to make into solution for the many applications of chromium trioxide.⁴⁴

- 2) *Whether there are perceived to be separate markets for the upstream and downstream articles*

The petitioner states that “there is no independent market for dry chromium trioxide.”⁴⁵

- 3) *Differences in the physical characteristics and functions of the upstream and downstream articles*

The petitioner explains that the only difference between chromium trioxide in powder and solution forms is that the solution contains water.⁴⁶

- 4) *Differences in the costs or value of the vertically differentiated articles*

The petitioner explains that chromium trioxide in solution form is usually more expensive than chromium trioxide in dry form due to the additional time and cost needed to produce the solution, and the added value provided to the customer who does not need to mix the solution themselves.⁴⁷ The petitioner clarifies that the higher the concentration of dry chromium trioxide in a solution, the greater its cost will be.⁴⁸ The petitioner states that many customers buy chromium trioxide powder and mix it into a solution themselves.⁴⁹

- 5) *The significance and extent of the processes used to transform the upstream into the downstream articles*

The petitioner states little processing is needed to convert chromium trioxide powder into chromium trioxide solution.⁵⁰ The petitioner explains that chromium trioxide powder is simply mixed with water to create a solution with the desired concentration.⁵¹ The petitioner adds that

⁴³ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 18-20).

⁴⁴ *Id.* at 19.

⁴⁵ *Id.*

⁴⁶ *Id.*

⁴⁷ *Id.*

⁴⁸ *Id.*

⁴⁹ *Id.*

⁵⁰ *Id.* at 20.

⁵¹ *Id.*

this process only requires a vessel in which to mix the solution and safety equipment to ensure employees are not exposed to the product during this process.⁵²

Commerce's Position:

We analyzed the criteria presented by the petitioner with respect to the ITC's domestic like product factors, as well as the five factors traditionally analyzed by the ITC in its semifinished products analysis. Based on our analysis of the information submitted in the Petitions, we have determined that the domestic like product consists of chromium trioxide, as defined in the scope of the Petitions.⁵³ Information in the Petitions indicates that all chromium trioxide shares the same general physical characteristics and end uses and is generally interchangeable.⁵⁴ Information in the Petitions also indicates that all chromium trioxide is sold through the same or similar channels of distribution, and that customers and producers perceive all chromium trioxide as a single product.⁵⁵ Moreover, information in the Petitions indicates that chromium trioxide is manufactured in common facilities with the same production processes and production employees and that all chromium trioxide is priced within a similar range along a continuum.⁵⁶ Information in the Petitions further indicates that chromium trioxide in dry form is part of the same like product as chromium trioxide in solution form, as chromium trioxide in dry form is an intermediate product whose ultimate use is to be processed into chromium trioxide in solution form.⁵⁷

Furthermore, unless Commerce finds the petitioner's definition of the domestic like product to be inaccurate, we will adopt the domestic like product definition set forth in the Petitions.⁵⁸ We analyzed the information presented by the petitioner and found that there is reason to conclude that all chromium trioxide constitutes a single domestic like product. This is consistent with Commerce's broad discretion to define and clarify the scope of an antidumping or countervailing duty investigation in a manner that reflects the intent of the Petitions.⁵⁹ Consequently, Commerce's discretion permits interpreting the Petitions in such a way as to best effectuate not only the intent of the Petitions, but the overall purpose of the antidumping and countervailing duty laws as well.⁶⁰

⁵² *Id.*

⁵³ See Attachment I – Scope of the Investigation, to this Checklist; *see also* Petitions at Volume I (pages 4-11 and 14-20 and Exhibits GEN-1, GEN-3 through GEN-6, GEN-8 through GEN-10, and GEN-19); *see also* General Issues Supplement at 7.

⁵⁴ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 15-17 and Exhibit GEN-19).

⁵⁵ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 17-18); *see also* General Issues Supplement at 7.

⁵⁶ See Petitions at Volume I (page 18).

⁵⁷ *Id.* at 18-20.

⁵⁸ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 10-15 and Exhibits I-10 through I-12); *see also* General Issues Supplement at 10.

⁵⁹ See, e.g., *Fujitsu*, 36 F.Supp.2d 394 (citing *Kern-Liebers USA, Inc. v. United States*, 19 C.I.T. 393, 396, 881 F.Supp. 618, 621 (1995) (citation omitted)); and *Initiation of Antidumping Duty Investigations: Spring Table Grapes from Chile and Mexico*, 66 FR 26831 (May 15, 2001).

⁶⁰ See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Freshwater Crawfish Tail Meat from the People's Republic of China*, 62 FR 41347, 42357 (August 1, 1997).

IV. Industry Support Calculation

In determining whether the petitioner has standing (*i.e.*, those domestic workers and producers supporting the Petitions account for: (1) at least 25 percent of the total production of the domestic like product, and (2) more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for, or opposition to, the Petitions), in accordance with sections 702(c)(4)(A) and 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act, we conducted the following analysis.

We considered the industry support data contained in the Petitions with reference to the domestic like product as defined in Attachment I, “Scope of the Investigation,” to this Checklist, and as discussed above. The petitioner states that it is the sole producer of the domestic like product.⁶¹ To support its establishment of the universe of producers, the petitioner provided a declaration from [], who has held that position for [] years and has over [] years of experience in the chemical industry.⁶² In the declaration, [] states that, based on []

[].⁶³ The petitioner produced [] metric tons of chromium trioxide in calendar year 2024.⁶⁴ Based on the available information indicating that the petitioner is the only U.S. producer of the domestic like product, the petitioner determined that it accounts for 100 percent of total production of the domestic like product in 2024.⁶⁵

Challenges to Industry Support

None.

V. Findings

Commerce relied on information provided by the petitioner, as described above, to establish total 2024 production of the domestic like product. Using these data, as demonstrated above, we find that the domestic producers and workers who support the Petitions account for at least 25 percent of total production of the domestic like product. Commerce further finds that domestic producers and workers who support the Petitions account for more than 50 percent of the total production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing

⁶¹ See Petitions at Volume I (page 1 and Exhibits GEN-1 and GEN-2); *see also* General Issues Supplement at 5-6 and Exhibit GEN Supp-4.

⁶² *Id.* at Exhibit GEN-1.

⁶³ *Id.*

⁶⁴ *Id.* at Exhibit GEN-3.

⁶⁵ *Id.* at 1-3 and Exhibits GEN-1 through GEN-3; *see also* General Issues Supplement at 5-6 and Exhibit GEN Supp-4.

support for, or opposition to, the Petitions. Therefore, we find that there is adequate industry support within the meaning of sections 702(c)(4)(A) and 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act.

Commerce conducted a search of the Internet and has been unable to locate information that contradicts the petitioner's assertions. We find that the petitioner has provided data that are reasonably available. For these reasons, we find that there is adequate industry support for initiating these investigations. Accordingly, Commerce finds that the Petitions have met the requirements of sections 702(c)(4)(A) and 732(c)(4)(A) of the Act.

Attachment III

Analysis of Allegations and Evidence of Material Injury and Causation for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Chromium Trioxide from India and the Republic of Türkiye

I. Introduction

When making a determination regarding the initiation of antidumping and countervailing duty investigations, the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) examines, on the basis of sources readily available to Commerce, the accuracy and adequacy of the evidence contained in the petitions, and determines whether the petitions allege the elements necessary for the imposition of antidumping and countervailing duties and contain information reasonably available to the petitioner that supports the allegations.¹ This attachment analyzes the sufficiency of the allegations and supporting evidence regarding material injury and causation.²

II. Definition of Domestic Industry

The domestic industry is described with reference to producers of the domestic like product, as provided for in section 771(4)(A) of the Act. The Petitions³ define the domestic industry as all U.S. producers of chromium trioxide.⁴ The petitioner⁵ identifies itself as the sole producer constituting the domestic industry in the United States.⁶ For a discussion of the domestic like product, *see* Attachment II, Analysis of Industry Support for the Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Petitions Covering Chromium Trioxide from India and the Republic of Türkiye.

III. Evidence of Material Injury, or Threat of Material Injury, and Causation

In making a determination regarding material injury and causation, the U.S. International Trade Commission (ITC) is directed to evaluate the volume of subject imports (section 771(7)(B)(i)(I) of the Act), the effect of those imports on the prices of domestically-produced like products (section 771(7)(B)(i)(II) of the Act), and their impact on the domestic operations of U.S. producers of like products (section 771(7)(B)(i)(III) of the Act) and may consider other economic factors (section 771(7)(B)(ii) of the Act). Additionally, section 771(7)(C)(iii) of the Act states that:

¹ See sections 702(c)(1)(A)(i) and 732(c)(1)(A)(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

² See 19 CFR 351.202(b)(10).

³ See Petitioner's Letter, "Petitions for the Imposition of Antidumping and Countervailing Duties," dated September 29, 2025 (Petitions). The petitioner filed its letter, "Response to General Issues Supplemental Questions," dated November 20, 2025 (General Issues Supplement).

⁴ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 20-21).

⁵ The petitioner is American Chrome & Chemicals, Inc. (the petitioner). See Petitions at Volume I (page 2 and Exhibits GEN-1 and GEN-2).

⁶ See Petitions at Volume I (page 2 and Exhibits GEN-1 and GEN-2); *see also* General Issues Supplement at 5-6 and Exhibit GEN Supp-4).

{i}n examining the impact {of imports on domestic producers} ..., the {ITC} shall evaluate all relevant economic factors which have a bearing on the state of the industry in the United States, including, but not limited to—

- (I) actual and potential decline in output, sales, market share, gross profits, operating profits, net profits, ability to service debt, productivity, return on investments, return on assets, and utilization of capacity,
- (II) factors affecting domestic prices,
- (III) actual and potential negative effects on cash flow, inventories, employment, wages, growth, ability to raise capital, and investment,
- (IV) actual and potential negative effects on the existing development and production efforts of the domestic industry ..., and
- (V) in {an antidumping proceeding} ..., the magnitude of the margin of dumping.

Information relevant to the petitioner's allegations of material injury, or threat thereof, and causation can be found in Volume I of the Petitions at 27-43 and Exhibits GEN-1, GEN-3, GEN-12, GEN-13, GEN-16, GEN-18, and GEN-22 through GEN-25, and the General Issues Supplement at 7.

The petitioner alleges that the domestic industry has experienced the following types of material injury by reason of U.S. imports from India and the Republic of Türkiye (Türkiye):

- significant increase in the volume of subject imports;
- increased market share of subject imports;
- underselling and price suppression;
- lost sales and revenues;
- declines in production and capacity utilization; and
- negative impact on financial performance.

The petitioner also alleges that the domestic industry could be threatened with the following types of further injury by reason of U.S. imports from India and Türkiye:

- vulnerability of the domestic industry to further injury by reason of subject imports;
- continued increase in the volume of subject imports;
- potential for significant new and unused capacity of subject producers;
- continued adverse price effects; and
- countervailable subsidies provided by the Government of India.

The Petitions allege that the material injury, or threat thereof, to the domestic industry were caused by the impact of the allegedly dumped and subsidized imports from India and Türkiye. The information relevant to the petitioner's allegations, as referenced above, demonstrates the effect of these imports on domestic prices and market share, and the consequent impact on the domestic industry, specifically on the domestic industry's operations and financial performance.

The allegations of causation of material injury, or threat thereof, are based upon the factors indicating current material injury, as well as the factors indicating threat of material injury as noted above. The factors related to causation presented in the Petitions are the types of factors that the ITC is directed to consider for the purpose of evaluating causation under sections 771(7)(C) and 771(7)(F) of the Act.

IV. Cumulation

Section 771(7)(G)(i) of the Act requires the ITC to cumulate imports from all countries for which petitions were filed on the same day if such imports compete with each other and with the domestic like product in the U.S. market. In determining whether cumulation is appropriate, the ITC uses a framework of four factors:⁷

- The degree of fungibility between imports from the subject countries and between the subject imports and the domestic like product;
- The presence of sales or offers for sale of the subject imports and the domestic like product in the same geographic markets;
- Whether the subject imports and the domestic like product are handled in common or similar channels of distribution; and
- Whether the subject imports are present in the U.S. market simultaneously.

The petitioner addresses each of these factors and argues that a reasonable overlap of competition exists with subject imports and with the domestic like product in the United States, and, as a result, the criteria for cumulation have been satisfied.⁸

V. Negligibility

Section 771(24)(A)(i) of the Act states that “imports from a country of merchandise corresponding to a domestic like product identified by the Commission are ‘negligible’ if such imports account for less than 3 percent of the volume of all such merchandise imported into the United States in the most recent 12-month period for which the data are available”

The petitioner contends that imports from India and Türkiye are not negligible.⁹ The data provided by the petitioner demonstrate that imports of chromium trioxide from India and Türkiye individually exceed the three percent negligibility threshold provided under section 771(24)(A)(i) of the Act.¹⁰

⁷ See *Certain Cast-Iron Pipe Fittings from Brazil, the Republic of Korea, and Taiwan*, Inv. Nos. 731-TA-278-280 (Final), USITC Pub. 1845 (May 1986); see also *Fundicao Tupy, S.A. v. United States*, 678 F. Supp. 898, 902 (CIT 1988), aff'd *Fundicao Tupy, S.A. v. United States*, 859 F.2d 915 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

⁸ See Petitions at Volume I (pages 23 through 26 and Exhibits GEN-1, GEN-21, and GEN-22); see also General Issues Supplement at 7.

⁹ See Petitions at Volume I (page 21-23 and Exhibits GEN-18 and GEN-20).

¹⁰ *Id.*

VI. Conclusion

To assess the accuracy and adequacy of the evidence relating to the allegations regarding material injury, threat of material injury, negligibility, and causation, we examined the information presented in the Petitions and compared it with information that was reasonably available (e.g., import data on the ITC website). We did not locate any information that contradicts the petitioner's assertions.

We analyzed the petitioner's evidence regarding material injury, threat of material injury, negligibility, and causation, and have found that the information in the Petitions and the supplements thereto demonstrates a sufficient showing of material injury, or threat of material injury, to the U.S. industry producing chromium trioxide. Therefore, we find the overall evidence of injury included in the Petitions to be adequate to initiate the investigations of chromium trioxide from India and Türkiye. Ultimately, the ITC will make the final determination with respect to material injury, or threat thereof, negligibility, and causation.