

with the regulations and terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: December 2, 2015.

Christian Marsh,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

Appendix—List of Topics Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

Summary
Background
Scope of the Order
Discussion of the Issues

General Comments

1. Duty Drawback
2. Duty Drawback and Treatment of the Resource Utilization Support Fund
3. Deducting Certain Expenses from the Duty Drawback Calculation
4. Making a Duty Drawback Adjustment to Normal Value and/or Capping the U.S. Duty Drawback Adjustment
5. Treatment of Duty Drawback in the Cash Deposit Rate and Assessment Rate
6. Other Arguments Related to Duty Drawback
7. Differential Pricing Analysis Should Not Be Used Because the Cohen's *d* Test Does Not Measure Targeted or Masked Dumping
8. Differential Pricing Analysis Reasoning for Use of Average-to-Transaction Comparison Methodology is Arbitrary and Unlawful

Company-Specific Comments

Borusan

9. Duty Drawback and Treatment of the Yield Loss Factor
10. Home Market Sales of Overruns and the Ordinary Course of Trade
11. Domestic Inland Freight Expenses
12. International Freight Expenses

Toscelik

13. Billing Adjustments
14. Duty Drawback
15. Duty Drawback Adjustment to Cost
16. Toscelik's Net Financial Expense Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2015-31188 Filed 12-9-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD

[Recommendation 2015-1]

Emergency Preparedness and Response at the Pantex Plant

AGENCY: Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.

ACTION: Notice, recommendation; correction.

SUMMARY: The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (Board) published a notice of a recommendation to the Secretary of Energy in the **Federal Register** of December 3, 2015, (80 FR 75665), concerning emergency preparedness at the Pantex Plant. The Board corrects that notice by providing the additional information as set forth below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mark Welch, General Manager, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, 625 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 700, Washington, DC 20004-2901, or telephone number (202) 694-7000.

Correction

In the **Federal Register** of December 3, 2015, in FR Doc. 2015-30562, on page 75673, in the first column, after line 37, add the following information:

CORRESPONDENCE FROM THE SECRETARY

Department of Energy
Under Secretary for Nuclear Security
Administrator, National Nuclear
Security Administration
Washington, DC 20585
November 4, 2015

The Honorable Joyce L. Connery
Chairman
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
65 Indiana Avenue NW., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20004
Dear Madam Chairman:

On behalf of the Secretary, thank you for the opportunity to review the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) Draft Recommendation 2015-1, *Emergency Preparedness and Response at the Pantex Plant*. The National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) has established specific performance goals for the Pantex Emergency Management Program, to include improvements in the three areas highlighted by the Draft Recommendation 2015-1. These goals are consistent with the mutually agreed-upon benefits of implementing the DNFSB Recommendation 2014-1.

The draft Recommendation's risk assessment states: "it is not possible to do a quantitative assessment of the risk of these [the Pantex Emergency Management Program] elements to provide adequate protection of the

workers and the public." As a point of clarification, the Department of Energy (DOE) demonstrates adequate protection of workers, the public and the environment as an integral part of operating a nuclear facility like that situated at the Pantex Plant. To this end, the Department has put in place a system of requirements, standards, policies and guidance that, when effectively implemented, not only provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection, but takes a very conservative approach to ensure such protection. Functions such as emergency management provide that additional conservatism and margin of protection. We are confident that, even with deficiencies identified by the DNFSB, the Pantex Emergency Management Program can perform its role to ensure this protection. Accordingly, DOE recommends removing the phrase: "in order to provide an adequate protection to the public and the workers" in justifying the need for the draft recommendation.

To increase protection assurances and drive improvement in an effective and efficient manner, I suggest that the best approach to address the concerns identified in your Draft Recommendation is to incorporate ongoing NNSA performance improvement initiatives and enhancements into the existing implementation plans for Recommendation 2014-1. This approach would enable the Department to take a holistic, integrated approach to making the needed improvements at Pantex.

We appreciate the DNFSB's perspective and look forward to continued positive interactions with you and your staff to include Pantex-specific actions and milestones in the existing Implementation Plan for Recommendation 2014-1.

If you have any questions, please contact me or Mr. Geoffrey Beausoleil, Manager, NNSA Production Office, at 865-576-0752.

Sincerely,

Frank G. Klotz

DISPOSITION OF DOE COMMENTS ON DRAFT RECOMMENDATION 2015-1

DOE comment	Board response	Revised wording
<p>The draft Recommendation's risk assessment states: "it is not possible to do a quantitative assessment of the risk of these [the Pantex Emergency Management Program] elements to provide adequate protection of the workers and the public." As a point of clarification, the Department of Energy (DOE) demonstrates adequate protection of workers, the public and the environment as an integral part of operating a nuclear facility like that situated at the Pantex Plant. To this end, the Department has put in place a system of requirements, standards, policies and guidance that, when effectively implemented, not only provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection, but takes a very conservative approach to ensure such protection. Functions such as emergency management provide that additional conservatism and margin of protection. We are confident that, even with deficiencies identified by the DNFSB, the Pantex Emergency Management Program can perform its role to ensure this protection. Accordingly, DOE recommends removing the phrase: "in order to provide an adequate protection to the public and the workers" in justifying the need for the draft recommendation.</p>	<p>Upon review of Draft Recommendation 2015-1, in the noted phrase the word "provide" was used, whereas, in similar references to adequate protection in other parts of Draft Recommendation 2015-1, the word "ensure" was used. The Board voted to amend the language to reflect that the Recommendation is intended to ensure adequate protection.</p>	<p>Original wording of last sentence in first paragraph of the text of the Recommendation: "We believe that DOE and National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) must address these concerns in order to provide an adequate protection to the public and the workers at the Pantex Plant." Revised wording: "We believe that DOE and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) must address these concerns in order to ensure the adequate protection of the public and the workers at the Pantex Plant."</p>
<p>To increase protection assurances and drive improvement in an effective and efficient manner, I suggest that the best approach to address the concerns identified in your Draft Recommendation is to incorporate ongoing NNSA performance improvement initiatives and enhancements into the existing implementation plans for Recommendation 2014-1. This approach would enable the Department to take a holistic, integrated approach to making the needed improvements at Pantex.</p>	<p>As noted in the "Findings, Supporting Data, and Analysis" document of Draft Recommendation 2015-1, the problems identified in Draft Recommendation 2015-1 will not be adequately addressed by the Board's Recommendation 2014-1, <i>Emergency Preparedness and Response</i>.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Dated: December 4, 2015.

Joyce L. Connery,
Chairman.

[FR Doc. 2015-31093 Filed 12-9-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3670-01-P

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

[Docket No.: ED-2015-ICCD-0137]

Agency Information Collection Activities; Comment Request; Evaluation of Effectiveness of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results (SOAR) Program

AGENCY: Institute of Education Sciences (IES), Department of Education (ED).

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 3501 *et seq.*), ED is proposing an extension of an existing information collection.

DATES: Interested persons are invited to submit comments on or before February 8, 2016.

ADDRESSES: To access and review all the documents related to the information collection listed in this notice, please use <http://www.regulations.gov> by searching the Docket ID number ED-

2015-ICCD-0137. Comments submitted in response to this notice should be submitted electronically through the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov> by selecting the Docket ID number or via postal mail, commercial delivery, or hand delivery. Please note that comments submitted by fax or email and those submitted after the comment period will not be accepted. Written requests for information or comments submitted by postal mail or delivery should be addressed to the Director of the Information Collection Clearance Division, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW., LBJ, Room 2E115, Washington, DC 20202-4537.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: For specific questions related to collection activities, please contact Meredith Bachman, 202-219-2014.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Education (ED), in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (PRA) (44 U.S.C. 3506(c)(2)(A)), provides the general public and Federal agencies with an opportunity to comment on proposed, revised, and continuing collections of information. This helps the Department assess the impact of its information collection requirements and minimize

the public's reporting burden. It also helps the public understand the Department's information collection requirements and provide the requested data in the desired format. ED is soliciting comments on the proposed information collection request (ICR) that is described below. The Department of Education is especially interested in public comment addressing the following issues: (1) Is this collection necessary to the proper functions of the Department; (2) will this information be processed and used in a timely manner; (3) is the estimate of burden accurate; (4) how might the Department enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (5) how might the Department minimize the burden of this collection on the respondents, including through the use of information technology. Please note that written comments received in response to this notice will be considered public records.

Title of Collection: Evaluation of Effectiveness of the Scholarships for Opportunity and Results (SOAR) Program.

OMB Control Number: 1850-0800.

Type of Review: An extension of an existing information collection.