

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****International Trade Administration**

[A-533-823; A-834-807; A-307-820]

**Silicomanganese From India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela: Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Orders**

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* February 7, 2013.

**SUMMARY:** On October 1, 2012, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) initiated the second sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela. The Department finds that revocation of these antidumping duty orders would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the rates identified in the “Final Results of Reviews” section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sean Carey, AD/CVD Operations, Office 6, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-3964.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****Background**

The antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela were published on May 23, 2002. *See Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Orders: Silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela*, 67 FR 36149 (May 23, 2002).

On October 1, 2012, the Department initiated the second sunset reviews of these orders, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (“the Act”). *See Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review*, 77 FR 59897 (October 1, 2012) (“notice of initiation”). The Department received a notice of intent to participate from the following domestic parties: Eramet Marietta, Inc. and Felman Production, LLC (collectively, “domestic interested parties”), within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). Each of these companies is a manufacturer of a domestic-like product in the United States and, accordingly, is a domestic interested party pursuant to section 771(9)(C) of the Act.

On October 31, 2012, the Department received adequate substantive responses

to the notice of initiation from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). In the sunset review of the antidumping order on silicomanganese from India, we received one response from a respondent interested party, Nava Bharat Ventures Limited (“Nava Bharat”) <sup>1</sup> on November 7, 2012, and found that Nava Bharat provided an inadequate response because it did not export subject merchandise to the United States over the five calendar years preceding the initiation of this review. <sup>2</sup> The Department received no responses from other respondent interested parties. On the basis of notices of intent to participate and adequate substantive responses filed on behalf of domestic interested parties, and the inadequate response from the only respondent interested party to have filed a submission, Nava Bharat, the Department has conducted expedited sunset reviews of these orders pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C). As a result of these sunset reviews, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty orders is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the rates indicated in the “Final Results of Reviews” section of this notice.

**Scope of the Orders**

For purposes of these orders, the products covered are all forms, sizes and compositions of silicomanganese, except low-carbon silicomanganese, including silicomanganese briquettes, fines and slag. Silicomanganese is a ferroalloy composed principally of manganese, silicon and iron, and normally contains much smaller proportions of minor elements, such as carbon, phosphorous and sulfur. Silicomanganese is sometimes referred to as ferrosilicon manganese. Silicomanganese is used primarily in steel production as a source of both silicon and manganese. Silicomanganese generally contains by weight not less than 4 percent iron, more than 30 percent manganese, more than 8 percent silicon and not more than 3 percent phosphorous. Silicomanganese is properly classifiable

<sup>1</sup> On October 19, 2012, Nava Bharat requested an extension of time to file its substantive response. The Department granted an extension until November 7, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> *See* Memorandum from Sunset Team to Barbara E. Tillman, Director, Office of AD/CVD Operations 6 regarding “Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Silicomanganese from India: Adequacy Determination,” dated November 23, 2012.

under subheading 7202.30.0000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”). Some silicomanganese may also be classified under HTSUS subheading 7202.99.5040.

The low-carbon silicomanganese excluded from this scope is a ferroalloy with the following chemical specifications: Minimum 55 percent manganese, minimum 27 percent silicon, minimum 4 percent iron, maximum 0.10 percent phosphorus, maximum 0.10 percent carbon and maximum 0.05 percent sulfur. Low-carbon silicomanganese is used in the manufacture of stainless steel and special carbon steel grades, such as motor lamination grade steel, requiring a very low carbon content. It is sometimes referred to as ferromanganese-silicon. Low-carbon silicomanganese is classifiable under HTSUS subheading 7202.99.5040.

This scope covers all silicomanganese, regardless of its tariff classification. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope remains dispositive.

**Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in these reviews are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum (“Decision Memorandum”) from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, dated January 31, 2013, which is hereby adopted by this notice. The issues discussed in the Decision Memorandum include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the orders were revoked. Parties can find a complete discussion of all issues raised in these reviews and the corresponding recommendations in this public memorandum, which is on file electronically via Import Administration’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (“IA ACCESS”). IA ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://iaaccess.trade.gov> and is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit in room 7046 of the main Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Internet at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/>. The signed Decision Memorandum and electronic versions of the Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

**Final Results of Reviews**

Pursuant to sections 752(c)(1) and (3) of the Act, we determine that revocation of the antidumping duty orders on silicomanganese from India, Kazakhstan, and Venezuela would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and that the magnitude of the margins of dumping likely to prevail if the order were revoked are as follows:

Exporters/producers	Rate (percent)
<i>India</i>	
Nava Bharat Ventures, Ltd. ....	15.32
Universal Ferro and Allied Chemicals, Ltd. ...	20.53
All Others Rate .....	17.74
<i>Kazakhstan</i>	
Alloy 2000, S.A. ....	247.88
Kazakhstan-Wide Rate ..	247.88
<i>Venezuela</i>	
Hornos Eléctricos de Venezuela, S.A. ....	24.62
All Others Rate .....	24.62

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (“APO”) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective orders is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation which is subject to sanction.

We are issuing and publishing the final results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 31, 2013.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2013-02822 Filed 2-6-13; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****National Telecommunications and Information Administration****Renewal and Revision of a Previously Approved Information Collection; Comment Request; State Broadband Data and Development Grant Program**

**ACTION:** Notice.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce, as part of its continuing effort to reduce paperwork and

respondent burden, invites the general public and other Federal agencies to comment on continuing and revising this information collection, as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, Public Law 104-13 (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)).

**DATES:** Written comments must be submitted on or before April 8, 2013.

**ADDRESSES:** Direct all written comments to Jennifer Jessup, Departmental Paperwork Clearance Officer, Department of Commerce, Room 6616, 14th and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230 (or via the Internet at [Jjessup@doc.gov](mailto:Jjessup@doc.gov)).

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Requests for additional information or copies of the information collection instrument(s) and instructions should be directed to Anne Neville, Director, State Broadband Initiative, National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA), Room 4898, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington DC 20230 (or via email to [aneville@ntia.doc.gov](mailto:aneville@ntia.doc.gov)).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:****I. Abstract**

This request is for an extension and revision of a currently approved information collection.

In 2009 and 2010, under the Broadband Data Improvement Act and the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009, NTIA awarded grants to states, or their designees, to gather and verify state-specific broadband data, including the maximum advertised speed, technology type and spectrum (if applicable) for each broadband provider offering service in each census block, or, in census blocks greater than two square miles, each road segment (*See* 74 FR 32545, July 8, 2009 and 74 FR 46573, Sept. 10, 2009). Additionally, grants included funding to collect the maximum advertised speed and technology type to which various classes of Community Anchor Institutions (CAIs) subscribe. Recipients are funded to conduct this activity until approximately December 31, 2014.

The recipients gather and verify data twice per year, submitting the information to NTIA each October 1 and April 1. States use the data to populate state broadband maps, and NTIA uses the data to populate the National Broadband Map. The data is also freely available for stakeholders to use, via Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and in various file formats. Numerous public and private stakeholders currently use the data to

inform funding, policy and commercial decisions. Consumers and businesses use the data to identify where broadband is available, the advertised speeds and other information.

Despite the importance of broadband to the U.S. economy, information about broadband availability was not widely available until NTIA and the states developed this dataset. The data collected will continue to provide critical information for grant-making, regulatory and policy-making efforts, and to improve the quality of state-level broadband information.

NTIA proposes to revise the currently approved reporting requirements to include with each submission of data several “best practices” documents including a document describing each recipient’s methodology for collecting and verifying data, a document that summarizes any major changes or corrections to data from the previous submission and a short text file (also known as a “readme” file) that summarizes basic, technical information for the dataset. Recipients began providing this information to NTIA as a best practice because it provided more transparency into their process and supported the efficient review of data. Note that at this time, NTIA is not proposing to revise the broadband availability or CAI adoption data that each recipient collects, though it may consider changes at a future date.

**II. Method of Collection**

Awardees will continue to submit all reports via the Internet.

**III. Data**

*OMB Control Number:* 0660-0032.

*Form Number:* None.

*Type of Review:* Regular submission (revision and extension of a currently approved collection).

*Affected Public:* States, territories and the District of Columbia or their designees. Subrespondents include facilities-based providers of broadband connections, incumbent and competitive local exchange carriers, facilities-based mobile telephony service providers and wireless Internet service providers.

*Estimated Number of Total Respondents:* 56 respondents; 2,000 subrespondents.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 3,123 hours for respondents; 50 hours for subrespondents.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 549,776.

*Estimated Total Annual Cost to the Public:* \$0.