

weight averaging the rates of the two individually investigated respondents, because doing so risks disclosure of proprietary information. Therefore, for the “all-others” rate, we calculated a simple average of the two responding firms’ rates.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i)(1) of the Act, we intend to verify the information submitted by the respondents prior to making our final determination.

Disclosure and Public Comment

The Department will disclose calculations performed for this preliminary determination to the parties within five days of the date of public announcement of this determination in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b). Case briefs or other written comments for all non-scope issues may be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance no later than seven days after the date on which the final verification report is issued in this proceeding, and rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be submitted no later than five days after the deadline date for case briefs.⁴ A table of contents, list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. This summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, filed electronically using IA ACCESS. An electronically filed request for a hearing must be received successfully in its entirety by the Department’s electronic records system, IA ACCESS, by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice.⁵ Requests should contain the party’s name, address, and telephone number; the number of participants; and a list of the issues to be discussed. If a request for a hearing is made, the Department intends to hold the hearing at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, at a date and time to be determined. Parties will be notified of the date and time of any hearing. The hearing will be limited to issues raised in the respective briefs.⁶

⁴ See 19 CFR 351.309; see also 19 CFR 351.303 (for general filing requirements).

⁵ See 19 CFR 351.310(c).

⁶ *Id.*

International Trade Commission Notification

In accordance with section 703(f) of the Act, we will notify the International Trade Commission (“ITC”) of our determination. In addition, we are making available to the ITC all non-privileged and non-proprietary information relating to this investigation. We will allow the ITC access to all privileged and business proprietary information in our files, provided the ITC confirms that it will not disclose such information, either publicly or under an administrative protective order, without the written consent of the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

In accordance with section 705(b)(2) of the Act, if our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will make its final determination within 45 days after the Department makes its final determination.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 703(f) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.205(c).

Dated: September 22, 2014.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memo

- I. Summary
- II. Background
 - A. Case History
 - B. Period of Investigation
- III. Scope Comments
- IV. Scope of the Investigation
- V. Alignment
- VI. Respondent Selection
- VII. Injury Test
- VIII. Application of the Countervailing Duty Law to Imports from the PRC
- IX. Subsidies Valuation
 - A. Allocation Period
 - B. Attribution of Subsidies
 - C. Denominators
- X. Benchmarks and Discount Rates
 - A. Short-Term RMB-Denominated Loans
 - B. Long-Term RMB-Denominated Loans
 - C. Foreign Currency-Denominated Loans
 - D. Discount Rates
- XI. Use of Facts Otherwise Available and Adverse Inferences
- XII. Analysis of Programs
 - A. Programs Preliminarily Determined to Be Countervailable
 1. Preferential Loans to SOEs
 2. Export Seller’s Credits from China Ex-Im
 3. Provision of Electricity for LTAR
 4. Provision of Hot-Rolled Sheet and Plate for LTAR
 5. Provision of Hot-Rolled Steel I-Beams for LTAR
 6. Two Free/Three Half Program for Foreign Invested Enterprises (FIEs)

7. Preferential Tax Programs for Enterprises Recognized as High or New Technology Enterprises (HNTEs)
8. Enterprise Tax Law Research and Development Program Grants
- B. Programs Preliminary Determined Not to Be Used During the POI
 1. Export Buyer’s Program
- C. Programs With No Measurable Benefit
 1. “Famous Brands” Program
 2. Other Grants to Singamas
- D. Programs For Which Additional Information is Needed
 1. Other Grants to CIMC

XIII. Verification

XIV. Conclusion

[FR Doc. 2014–23130 Filed 9–26–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–427–818]

Low-Enriched Uranium From France: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012–2013

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: On March 24, 2014, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on low-enriched uranium (LEU) from France.¹ The review covers one producer or exporter of the subject merchandise, Eurodif S.A., AREVA NC, and AREVA NC, Inc. (collectively AREVA). The Department determines that AREVA made no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR.

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 29, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Andrew Huston, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4261.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Since the *Preliminary Results*, the following events have taken place: the Department received timely case briefs from USEC Inc., and the United States Enrichment Corporation (collectively Petitioners), and AREVA on April 23, 2014. Petitioners, AREVA, and Global

¹ See *Low Enriched Uranium from France; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2012–2013*, 79 FR 15955 (March 24, 2014) (*Preliminary Results*).

Nuclear Fuel—Americas, filed timely rebuttal briefs on April 28, 2014.

Period of Review

The period of review (POR) is February 1, 2012, through January 31, 2013.

Scope of the Order

The product covered by the order is all low-enriched uranium. Low-enriched uranium is enriched uranium hexafluoride (UF₆) with a U²³⁵ product assay of less than 20 percent that has not been converted into another chemical form, such as UO₂, or fabricated into nuclear fuel assemblies, regardless of the means by which the LEU is produced (including low-enriched uranium produced through the down-blending of highly enriched uranium).²

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised by the parties in the case and rebuttal briefs are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum is appended to this notice. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is available electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Services System (IA ACCESS). IA ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://iaaccess.trade.gov>, and it is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit of the main Commerce Building, room 7046. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum is also accessible on the internet at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

There has been no change to the Department's preliminary decision that AREVA had no shipments subject to the antidumping duty order. We revised the entry requirements and review process for merchandise conditionally excluded from the scope of the order, as discussed

² For a full description of the scope of the order, see "Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Low-Enriched Uranium from France: 2012–2013" from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance (Issues and Decision Memorandum), dated concurrently with these results and hereby adopted by this notice.

in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.³

Determination of No Shipments

We determine that AREVA had no shipments of merchandise subject to the antidumping duty order on LEU from France during the POR.

Determination of Revised Entry Requirements

To ensure proper enforcement of the order, the Department now determines that it is appropriate to suspend liquidation for shipments of LEU from France that previously entered without the suspension of liquidation. Such entries will be suspended, effective the date of publication of these final results of review, and cash deposits of estimated antidumping duties will be required, at a rate of zero percent *ad valorem*. Such entries will be examined and liquidated in accordance with the procedures described in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.⁴

Assessment Rates

Since the Department found that AREVA had no shipments during the POR, we did not calculate importer-specific assessment rates.

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003. This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by companies included in the final results of review for which these companies did not know that the merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to liquidate un-reviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.⁵

We intend to issue instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of this review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of LEU from France entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for AREVA will remain unchanged from the rate assigned to the company in the

³ See Comment 3 and "Suspension of Liquidation" section of the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

most recently completed review of that company, except for entries for which the importer claims to be excluded from the order under the re-export provision of the scope, which will require a cash deposit rate of zero percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period with a completed segment of this proceeding; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period with a completed segment of this proceeding for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 19.95 percent, the all-others rate established in the investigation.⁶ Entries accompanied by certifications from the exporter, the importer, and the end user, indicating that the LEU will be re-exported within 18 months will be subject to a cash deposit requirement of zero percent *ad valorem*. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Orders

This notice is the only reminder to parties subject to the administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under the APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3), which continues to govern business proprietary information in this segment of the proceeding. Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials, or conversion to judicial protective order, is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a final reminder to the importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping

⁶ See *Notice of Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order: Low Enriched Uranium From France*, 67 FR 6680 (February 13, 2002).

duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Notification to Interested Parties

These final results of administrative review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: September 22, 2014.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

Issues in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Order
- IV. Discussion of the Issues
 - Comment 1: Preliminary Finding of “No Shipments”
 - Comment 2: Filing of Entry Documents
 - Comment 3: Administrative Review Process for Merchandise Conditionally Excluded From the Scope of the Order
- V. Determination of No Shipments
- VI. Revised Entry Requirements
- VII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2014–23133 Filed 9–26–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–851–803]

Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel From the Czech Republic: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) determines that grain-oriented electrical steel (GOES) from the Czech Republic is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (LTFV), as provided in section 735 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). In addition, we determine that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of the subject merchandise from the Czech Republic. The period of investigation (POI) is July 1, 2012, through June 30, 2013. The final dumping margins of sales at LTFV are listed below in the “Final Determination” section of this notice.

DATES: *Effective Date:* September 29, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stephen Bailey at (202) 482–0193 or Dennis McClure at (202) 482–5973; AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 9, 2014, the Department published the *Preliminary Determination* of sales at LTFV of GOES from the Czech Republic.¹ The following events occurred since the *Preliminary Determination* was issued.

In May 2014, the Department verified the sales data submitted by ArcelorMittal Frydek-Mistek (AMFM) and its U.S. affiliate, ArcelorMittal International America LLC, in accordance with section 782(i) of the Act. We also issued a supplemental cost of production (COP) questionnaire to AMFM on May 9, 2014, and received the response to this supplemental questionnaire on June 3, 2014.

In June 2014, we verified the COP information submitted by AMFM, and we attempted to verify the sales information submitted by Sujani Enterprises, Ltd. (Sujani), in accordance with section 782(i) of the Act.

We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Determination*. On July 28 and August 4, 2014, the domestic industry,² AMFM, and Sujani submitted case and rebuttal briefs, respectively.

Scope of the Investigation

The scope of the investigation covers GOES, which is a flat-rolled alloy steel product containing by weight specific levels of silicon, carbon, and aluminum. For a complete description of the scope of the investigation, see Appendix I of this notice.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties in this investigation are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues raised is attached to this

¹ See *Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel From the Czech Republic: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, Negative Preliminary Determination of Critical Circumstances, and Postponement of Final Determination*, 79 FR 26717 (May 9, 2014) (*Preliminary Determination*).

² The domestic industry includes AK Steel Corporation, Allegheny Ludlum, LLC, and the United Steelworkers (*i.e.*, the parties filing the petition), as well as one additional domestic interested party, the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace, and Agricultural Implemental Workers of America (UAW).

notice as Appendix II. The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). IA ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://iaaccess.trade.gov> and it is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit, room 7046 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>. The signed and electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, in May and June 2014, we verified the sales and cost information submitted by AMFM for use in our final determination. We used standard verification procedures, including an examination of relevant accounting and production records, and original source documents provided by AMFM.³

In addition, as provided in section 782(i) of the Act, in June 2014, we also attempted to verify the sales information submitted by Sujani, using standard verification procedures.⁴ However, as noted in the Sujani Sales Verification Report, Sujani was unable to substantiate the data in its accounting system using independent sources, and it withheld information when requested by the Department’s verifiers. As a consequence, we find that Sujani’s reported data is unverifiable, and so incomplete that it cannot serve as a reliable basis for reaching a determination in this investigation.⁵

³ See Memorandum to the File from Stephen Bailey and Dennis McClure, Senior Analysts, entitled “Verification of ArcelorMittal International America LLC in the Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation of Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel from the Czech Republic,” dated June 11, 2014; Memorandum to the File from Stephen Bailey and Dennis McClure, Senior Analysts, entitled “Verification of Sales Response of ArcelorMittal Frydek-Mistek in the Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation of Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel from the Czech Republic,” dated July 3, 2014; and Memorandum to the File from Christopher J. Zimpo, Senior Accountant, entitled “Verification of Cost Response of ArcelorMittal Frydek-Mistek (“AMFM”) in the Antidumping Duty Investigation of Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel from the Czech Republic,” dated July 18, 2014.

⁴ See Memorandum to the File from Dennis McClure, Senior Analyst, and Stephen Banea, Analyst, Office II, AD/CVD Operations, entitled, “Verification of Sujani Enterprises, Inc. in the Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation of Grain-Oriented Electrical Steel from the Czech Republic,” dated July 16, 2013 (Sujani Sales Verification Report).

⁵ See sections 782(e)(2) and (3) of the Act.