

Musgrave, Senior Judge: In this Court No. 11-00252, the plaintiffs contested aspects of *Certain Frozen Fish Fillets from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Final Results of the Antidumping Duty New Shipper Reviews*, 76 Fed. Reg. 35403 (June 17, 2011) (seventh new shipper reviews) that were virtually identical to certain issues raised in Court No. 11-00109 and that were addressed in the context of Slip Op. 13-63 (May 23, 2013), familiarity with which is here presumed. Consistent therewith, this case was remanded to the International Trade Administration, United States Department of Commerce (“Commerce”) for further proceedings. Slip Op. 13-91 (July 22, 2013). The remand results entail Commerce’s analysis of the two broad issues remanded with the case for reconsideration, and they explain why Commerce continued on remand to maintain the selection of Bangladesh as the primary surrogate country and also explain the selection of surrogate values (“SVs”) for the fish waste and fish skin by-products using information from the “Vitarich” price quote. Accounting for all calculation changes that resulted from addressing the issues of the prior opinion(s), including Commerce’s voluntary remand request on the fish waste SV, Commerce determined the margins for all respondents as *de minimis*, including those for defendant-intervenors IDI Corporation and Thien Ma Seafood Company, who submitted comments on the draft remand results to Commerce but submit no further comments here. The plaintiffs argue for further remand with respect to Commerce’s “broad market average” analysis and “specificity” (*i.e.*, level of trade) reasoning, but for the reasons explained in Slip Op. 14-144 (Dec. 18, 2014), the results of remand will be sustained and judgment entered to that effect.

Dated: December 19, 2014
New York, New York

/s/ R. Kenton Musgrave
R. Kenton Musgrave, Senior Judge