

Return or Destruction of Proprietary Information

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to an administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation that is subject to sanction.

This determination is issued and published pursuant to sections 705(d) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: October 6, 2014.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix I

Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise subject to this investigation consists of non-oriented electrical steel (NOES), which includes cold-rolled, flat-rolled, alloy steel products, whether or not in coils, regardless of width, having an actual thickness of 0.20 mm or more, in which the core loss is substantially equal in any direction of magnetization in the plane of the material. The term “substantially equal” means that the cross grain direction of core loss is no more than 1.5 times the straight grain direction (*i.e.*, the rolling direction) of core loss. NOES has a magnetic permeability that does not exceed 1.65 Tesla when tested at a field of 800 A/m (equivalent to 10 Oersteds) along (*i.e.*, parallel to) the rolling direction of the sheet (*i.e.*, B_{800} value). NOES contains by weight more than 1.00 percent of silicon but less than 3.5 percent of silicon, not more than 0.08 percent of carbon, and not more than 1.5 percent of aluminum. NOES has a surface oxide coating, to which an insulation coating may be applied.

NOES is subject to this investigation whether it is fully processed (*i.e.*, fully annealed to develop final magnetic properties) or semi-processed (*i.e.*, finished to final thickness and physical form but not fully annealed to develop final magnetic properties). Fully processed NOES is typically made to the requirements of ASTM specification A 677, Japanese Industrial Standards (JIS) specification C 2552, and/or International Electrotechnical Commission (IEC) specification 60404–8–4. Semi-processed NOES is typically made to the requirements of ASTM specification A 683. However, the scope of this investigation is not limited to merchandise meeting the ASTM, JIS, and IEC specifications noted immediately above.

NOES is sometimes referred to as cold-rolled non-oriented (CRNO), non-grain oriented (NGO), non-oriented (NO), or cold-rolled non-grain oriented (CRNGO) electrical steel. These terms are interchangeable.

Excluded from the scope of this investigation are flat-rolled products not in coils that, prior to importation into the United States, have been cut to a shape and undergone all punching, coating, or other operations necessary for classification in Chapter 85 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) as a part (*i.e.*, lamination) for use in a device such as a motor, generator, or transformer.

The subject merchandise is provided for in subheadings 7225.19.0000, 7226.19.1000, and 7226.19.9000 of the HTSUS. Subject merchandise may also be entered under subheadings 7225.50.8085, 7225.99.0090, 7226.92.5000, 7226.92.7050, 7226.92.8050, 7226.99.0180 of the HTSUS. Although HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope is dispositive.

Appendix II

List of Comments and Issues in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Investigation
- IV. Subsidies Valuation Analysis of Programs
- V. Analysis of Programs
- VI. Analysis of Comments
 - Comment 1 Minor Corrections at the Verification of the Government of Korea
 - Comment 2 Regional Specificity and the Restriction of Special Taxation Act (RSTA) Article 26
 - Comment 3 The Use of Corporate Tax Returns in *De Facto* Specificity Analysis for RSTA Tax Deduction Programs
 - Comment 4 Analyzing the Number of Recipients of Certain RSTA Tax Programs Based on Average Life Span of Purchased Assets
 - Comment 5 Analyzing RSTA Articles 10(1)(1), 10(1)(2), and 10(1)(3) as One Program
 - Comment 6 The Number of RSTA Tax Incentives Recipients and “Limited”
 - Comment 7 The Korea Export-Import Bank as an “Authority”
 - Comment 8 Support for Acquisitions of Foreign Mines Program and *De Jure* Specificity
 - Comment 9 Loans from the Korean Resources Corporation and the Korea National Oil Corporation and *De Jure* Specificity
 - Comment 10 The Financial Contribution of DWI’s Debt Workout
 - Comment 11 DWI’s Debt to the Korea Export Insurance Corporation
- VII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2014–24379 Filed 10–10–14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–882]

Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide From the People’s Republic of China: Continuation of Antidumping Duty Order

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

SUMMARY: As a result of the determinations by the Department of Commerce (Department) and the International Trade Commission (ITC) that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) order on refined brown aluminum oxide (RBAO) from the People’s Republic of China (PRC) would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, the Department is publishing this notice of continuation of the AD order.

DATES: *Effective Date:* October 14, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Terre Keaton Stefanova, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1280.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 3, 2014, the Department initiated ¹ and the ITC instituted ² five-year (“sunset”) reviews of the AD order on RBAO from the PRC pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). As a result of its review, the Department determined that revocation of the AD order on RBAO from the PRC would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and, therefore, notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail should the order be revoked.³ On October 6, 2014, the ITC published its determination, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act, that revocation of the AD order on RBAO from the PRC would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of material injury to an

¹ See *Initiation of Five-Year (“Sunset”) Review*, 79 FR 6163 (February 3, 2014).

² See *Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide From China; Institution of a Five-Year Review*, 79 FR 6225 (February 3, 2014).

³ See *Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 79 FR 26207 (May 7, 2014).

industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time.⁴

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by this order is ground, pulverized or refined brown artificial corundum, also known as brown aluminum oxide or brown fused alumina, in grit size of $\frac{3}{8}$ inch or less. Excluded from the scope of the order is crude artificial corundum in which particles with a diameter greater than $\frac{3}{8}$ inch constitute at least 50 percent of the total weight of the entire batch. The scope includes brown artificial corundum in which particles with a diameter greater than $\frac{3}{8}$ inch constitute less than 50 percent of the total weight of the batch. The merchandise covered by this order is currently classifiable under subheadings 2818.10.20.00 and 2818.10.20.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise covered by the order is dispositive.

Continuation of the Order

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the ITC that revocation of the AD order would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act, the Department hereby orders the continuation of the AD order on RBAO from the PRC. U.S. Customs and Border Protection will continue to collect AD cash deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise. The effective date of the continuation of the order will be the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of this notice of continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act, the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of the order not later than 30 days prior to the fifth anniversary of the effective date of continuation.

This five-year ("sunset") review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(c) of the Act and published pursuant to section 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 8, 2014.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2014-24479 Filed 10-10-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C-570-997]

Non-Oriented Electrical Steel From the People's Republic of China: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination and Final Affirmative Critical Circumstances Determination

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) determines that countervailable subsidies are being provided to producers/exporters of non-oriented electrical steel (NOES) from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The Department also determines critical circumstances exist for imports of the subject merchandise from the PRC. The period of investigation is January 1, 2012, through December 31, 2012.

DATES: *Effective Date:* October 14, 2014.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joshua Morris or Thomas Schauer, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1779 and (202) 482-0410, respectively.

Background

The petitioner in this investigation is AK Steel Corporation (Petitioner). This investigation covers 30 government programs. The respondents in this investigation are the Government of the PRC (the GOC) and Baoshan Iron & Steel Co., Ltd. (Baoshan). For this final determination, we continue to rely on facts available, with adverse inferences, for the GOC and for Baoshan, the only mandatory company-respondent, because they did not act to the best of their abilities and did not respond to our requests for information. Further, we continue to draw an adverse inference in selecting from among the facts otherwise available to calculate the *ad valorem* rate for Baoshan.¹

Period of Investigation

The period for which we are measuring subsidies, or period of investigation, is January 1, 2012, through December 31, 2012.

Case History

The events that have occurred since the Department published the *Preliminary Determination* on March 25,

2014,² are discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.³ The Issues 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 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 on the Internet at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>. The signed and electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Scope of the Investigation

The merchandise subject to this investigation consists of NOES, which includes cold-rolled, flat-rolled, alloy steel products, whether or not in coils, regardless of width, having an actual thickness of 0.20 mm or more, in which the core loss is substantially equal in any direction of magnetization in the plane of the material. For a complete description of the scope of the investigation, *see* Appendix I to this notice.

Critical Circumstances

On February 25, 2014, Petitioner alleged that critical circumstances exist with respect to imports of NOES from the PRC. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.206(c)(2)(i), we issued an affirmative preliminary critical circumstances determination not later than the date of the preliminary determination.⁴

We received no comments on our preliminary critical circumstances determination. Thus, in accordance with section 705(a)(2) of the Act, we determine critical circumstances exist with respect to Baoshan and all other producers/exporters.

² See *Non-Oriented Electrical Steel From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination, Preliminary Affirmative Critical Circumstances Determination, and Alignment of Final Countervailing Duty Determination With Final Antidumping Duty Determination*, 79 FR 16293 (March 25, 2014) (*Preliminary Determination*).

³ See Memorandum to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Determination in the Countervailing Duty Investigation of Non-Oriented Electrical Steel from the People's Republic of China" dated concurrently with and hereby adopted by this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

⁴ See, e.g., *Change in Policy Regarding Timing of Issuance of Critical Circumstances Determinations*, 63 FR 55364 (October 15, 1998).

¹ See sections 776(a) and (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).