

The Census Bureau will release a public use file for availability to general data users via its Web site, with the ability to match to the 2014 SIPP public-use file.

## II. Method of Collection

The SSA Supplement will use the Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) mode of data collection. The SSA Supplement will be conducted as one interview per person once per SIPP Panel, after the completion of Wave 1 interviews. The interviews for the SSA Supplement will be conducted via the Census Bureau's three telephone centers with all household members 15 years old or over using regular proxy-respondent rules. The SSA Supplement interviews are expected to last 2 to 3 months beginning in September 2014.

## III. Data

*OMB Control Number:* 0607-XXXX.

*Form Number:* SSA Supplement/CATI Automated Instrument.

*Type of Review:* Regular.

*Affected Public:* Individuals or households.

*Estimated Number of Respondents:* 73,500.

*Estimated Time per Response:* 30 minutes.

*Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours:* 36,750.

*Estimated Total Annual Cost:* The only cost to respondents is their time.

*Respondent's Obligation:* Voluntary.

*Legal Authority:* Title 13, United States Code, Section 8(b) and Section 1110 of the Social Security Act.

## IV. Request for Comments

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information shall have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the agency's estimate of the burden (including hours and cost) of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on respondents, including through the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments submitted in response to this notice will be summarized and/or included in the request for OMB approval of this information collection; they also will become a matter of public record.

Dated: January 24, 2014.

### Gwellnar Banks,

*Management Analyst, Office of the Chief Information Officer.*

[FR Doc. 2014-01755 Filed 1-29-14; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3511-07-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Bureau of Industry and Security

#### Order Renewing Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges; Mahan Airways, et al.

In the matter of:

Mahan Airways, Mahan Tower, No. 21, Azadegan St., M.A. Jenah Exp. Way, Tehran, Iran;  
Zarand Aviation, a/k/a GIE Zarand Aviation, 42 Avenue Montaigne, 75008 Paris, France, and 112 Avenue Kleber, 75116 Paris, France;

Gatewick LLC, a/k/a Gatewick Freight & Cargo Services, a/k/a/Gatewick Aviation Services, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;

Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, a/k/a Kosarian Fard, P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;  
Mahmoud Amini, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404 Dubai, United Arab Emirates and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;

Kerman Aviation, a/k/a GIE Kerman Aviation, 42 Avenue Montaigne 75008, Paris, France;

Sirjanco Trading LLC, P.O. Box 8709, Dubai, United Arab Emirates;

Ali Eslamian, 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G0PW, United Kingdom, and 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road St. Johns Wood, London NW87RY, United Kingdom;

Mahan Air General Trading LLC, 19th Floor Al Moosa Tower One, Sheik Zayed Road, Dubai 40594, United Arab Emirates;  
Skyco (UK) Ltd., 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G 0PV, United Kingdom;

Equipco (UK) Ltd., 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road, London, NW8 7RY, United Kingdom;

Mehdi Bahrami, Mahan Airways- Istanbul Office, Cumhuriye Cad. Sibil Apt No: 101 D:6, 34374 Emadad, Sisli Istanbul, Turkey.

#### Order Renewing Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations, 15 CFR Parts 730-774 (2013) ("EAR" or the "Regulations"), I hereby grant the request of the Office of Export Enforcement ("OEE") to renew the July

31, 2013 Order Temporarily Denying the Export Privileges of Mahan Airways, Zarand Aviation, Gatewick LLC, Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, Mahmoud Amini, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., Equipco (UK) Ltd., and Mehdi Bahrami. I find that renewal of the Temporary Denial Order ("TDO") is necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR.

## I. Procedural History

On March 17, 2008, Darryl W. Jackson, the then-Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement ("Assistant Secretary"), signed a TDO denying Mahan Airways' export privileges for a period of 180 days on the grounds that its issuance was necessary in the public interest to prevent an imminent violation of the Regulations. The TDO also named as denied persons Blue Airways, of Yerevan, Armenia ("Blue Airways of Armenia"), as well as the "Balli Group Respondents," namely, Balli Group PLC, Balli Aviation, Balli Holdings, Vahid Alaghband, Hassan Alaghband, Blue Sky One Ltd., Blue Sky Two Ltd., Blue Sky Three Ltd., Blue Sky Four Ltd., Blue Sky Five Ltd., and Blue Sky Six Ltd., all of the United Kingdom. The TDO was issued *ex parte* pursuant to Section 766.24(a), and went into effect on March 21, 2008, the date it was published in the **Federal Register**.

The TDO subsequently has been renewed in accordance with Section 766.24(d), including most recently on July 31, 2013.<sup>1</sup> As of March 9, 2010, the Balli Group Respondents and Blue Airways were no longer subject to the TDO. As part of the February 25, 2011 TDO renewal, Gatewick LLC, Mahmoud Amini, and Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard ("Kosarian Fard") were added as related persons in accordance with Section 766.23 of the Regulations. On July 1, 2011, the TDO was modified by adding Zarand Aviation as a respondent in order to prevent an imminent violation. Specifically, Zarand Aviation owned an Airbus A310 subject to the Regulations that was being operated for the benefit of Mahan Airways in violation of both the TDO

<sup>1</sup> The July 31, 2013 Order was published in the **Federal Register** on August 7, 2013. 78 Fed. Reg. 48138 (Aug. 7, 2013). The TDO previously had been renewed on September 17, 2008, March 16, 2009, September 11, 2009, March 9, 2010, September 3, 2010, February 25, 2011, August 24, 2011, February 15, 2012, August 9, 2012, and February 4, 2013. The August 24, 2011 renewal followed the modification of the TDO on July 1, 2011, which added Zarand Aviation as a respondent. Each renewal or modification order was published in the **Federal Register**.

and the Regulations. As part of the August 24, 2011 renewal, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, and Ali Eslamian were added to the TDO as related persons. Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., and Equipco (UK) Ltd. were added as related persons on April 9, 2012. Mehdi Bahrami was added to the TDO as a related person as part of the February 4, 2013 renewal order.

On December 30, 2013, BIS, through its Office of Export Enforcement (“OEE”), submitted a written request for renewal of the TDO. The current TDO dated July 31, 2013, will expire on January 27, 2014, unless renewed on or before that date. Notice of the renewal request was provided to Mahan Airways and Zarand Aviation by delivery of a copy of the request in accordance with Sections 766.5 and 766.24(d) of the Regulations. No opposition to any aspect of the renewal of the TDO has been received from either Mahan Airways or Zarand Aviation. Furthermore, no appeal of the related person determinations I made as part of the September 3, 2010, February 25, 2011, August 24, 2011, April 9, 2012, and February 4, 2013 renewal or modification orders has been made by Gatewick LLC, Kosarian Fard, Mahmoud Amini, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., Equipco (UK) Ltd., or Mehdi Bahrami.<sup>2</sup>

## II. Renewal of the TDO

### A. Legal Standard

Pursuant to Section 766.24, BIS may issue or renew an order temporarily denying a respondent’s export privileges upon a showing that the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an “imminent violation” of the Regulations. 15 CFR §§ 766.24(b)(1) and 766.24(d). “A violation may be ‘imminent’ either in time or degree of likelihood.” 15 CFR § 766.24(b)(3). BIS may show “either that a violation is about to occur, or that the general circumstances of the matter under investigation or case under criminal or administrative charges demonstrate a likelihood of future violations.” *Id.* As to the likelihood of future violations, BIS may show that the violation under investigation or charge “is significant, deliberate, covert and/or likely to occur again, rather than technical or negligent [.]” *Id.* A “lack of information

<sup>2</sup> A party named or added as a related person may not oppose the issuance or renewal of the underlying temporary denial order, but may file an appeal of the related person determination in accordance with Section 766.23(c).

establishing the precise time a violation may occur does not preclude a finding that a violation is imminent, so long as there is sufficient reason to believe the likelihood of a violation.” *Id.*

### B. The TDO and BIS’s Request for Renewal

OEE’s request for renewal is based upon the facts underlying the issuance of the initial TDO and the TDO renewals in this matter and the evidence developed over the course of this investigation indicating a blatant disregard of U.S. export controls and the TDO. The initial TDO was issued as a result of evidence that showed that Mahan Airways and other parties engaged in conduct prohibited by the EAR by knowingly re-exporting to Iran three U.S.-origin aircraft, specifically Boeing 747s (“Aircraft 1–3”), items subject to the EAR and classified under Export Control Classification Number (“ECCN”) 9A991.b, without the required U.S. Government authorization. Further evidence submitted by BIS indicated that Mahan Airways was involved in the attempted re-export of three additional U.S.-origin Boeing 747s (“Aircraft 4–6”) to Iran.

As discussed in the September 17, 2008 renewal order, evidence presented by BIS indicated that Aircraft 1–3 continued to be flown on Mahan Airways’ routes after issuance of the TDO, in violation of the Regulations and the TDO itself.<sup>3</sup> It also showed that Aircraft 1–3 had been flown in further violation of the Regulations and the TDO on the routes of Iran Air, an Iranian Government airline. Moreover, as discussed in the March 16, 2009, September 11, 2009 and March 9, 2010 Renewal Orders, Mahan Airways registered Aircraft 1–3 in Iran, obtained Iranian tail numbers for them (including EP–MNA and EP–MNB), and continued to operate at least two of them in violation of the Regulations and the TDO,<sup>4</sup> while also committing an additional knowing and willful violation of the Regulations and the TDO when it negotiated for and acquired an additional U.S.-origin aircraft. The additional acquired aircraft was an MD–82 aircraft, which subsequently was painted in Mahan Airways’ livery and flown on multiple Mahan Airways’ routes under tail number TC–TUA.

<sup>3</sup> Engaging in conduct prohibited by a denial order violates the Regulations. 15 CFR §§ 764.2(a) and (k).

<sup>4</sup> The third Boeing 747 appeared to have undergone significant service maintenance and may not have been operational at the time of the March 9, 2010 renewal order.

The March 9, 2010 Renewal Order also noted that a court in the United Kingdom (“U.K.”) had found Mahan Airways in contempt of court on February 1, 2010, for failing to comply with that court’s December 21, 2009 and January 12, 2010 orders compelling Mahan Airways to remove the Boeing 747s from Iran and ground them in the Netherlands. Mahan Airways and the Balli Group Respondents had been litigating before the U.K. court concerning ownership and control of Aircraft 1–3. In a letter to the U.K. court dated January 12, 2010, Mahan Airways’ Chairman indicated, *inter alia*, that Mahan Airways opposes U.S. Government actions against Iran, that it continued to operate the aircraft on its routes in and out of Tehran (and had 158,000 “forward bookings” for these aircraft), and that it wished to continue to do so and would pay damages if required by that court, rather than ground the aircraft.

The September 3, 2010 renewal order discussed the fact that Mahan Airways’ violations of the TDO extended beyond operating U.S.-origin aircraft in violation of the TDO and attempting to acquire additional U.S.-origin aircraft. In February 2009, while subject to the TDO, Mahan Airways participated in the export of computer motherboards, items subject to the Regulations and designated as EAR99, from the United States to Iran, via the United Arab Emirates (“UAE”), in violation of both the TDO and the Regulations, by transporting and/or forwarding the computer motherboards from the UAE to Iran. Mahan Airways’ violations were facilitated by Gatewick LLC, which not only participated in the transaction, but also has stated to BIS that it acts as Mahan Airways’ sole booking agent for cargo and freight forwarding services in the UAE.

Moreover, in a January 24, 2011 filing in the U.K. court, Mahan Airways asserted that Aircraft 1–3 were not being used, but stated in pertinent part that the aircraft were being maintained in Iran especially “in an airworthy condition” and that, depending on the outcome of its U.K. court appeal, the aircraft “could immediately go back into service . . . on international routes into and out of Iran.” Mahan Airways’ January 24, 2011 submission to U.K. Court of Appeal, at p. 25, ¶¶ 108, 110. This clearly stated intent, both on its own and in conjunction with Mahan Airways’ prior misconduct and statements, demonstrated the need to renew the TDO in order to prevent imminent future violations. Two of these three 747s subsequently were removed from Iran and are no longer in

Mahan Airway's possession. The third of these 747s, with Manufacturer's Serial Number ("MSN") 23480 and Iranian tail number EP-MNE, remains in Iran under Mahan's control. Pursuant to Executive Order 13324, it was designated a Specially Designated Global Terrorist ("SDGT") by the U.S. Department of the Treasury's Office of Foreign Assets Control ("OFAC") on September 19, 2012.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, as discussed in the February 4, 2013 Order, open source information indicated that this 747, which is painted in the livery and logo of Mahan Airways, has been flown between Iran and Syria, and is suspected of ferrying weapons and/or other equipment to the Syrian Government from Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps. Open source information shows this aircraft remains in active operation in Mahan Airways' fleet and has been flown from Iran to Syria as recently as June 30, 2013.

In addition, as first detailed in the July 1, 2011 and August 24, 2011 orders, and discussed in the subsequent renewal orders in this matter, Mahan Airways also has continued to evade U.S. export control laws by operating two Airbus A310 aircraft, bearing Mahan Airways' livery, colors and logo, on flights into and out of Iran.<sup>6</sup> The aircraft are owned, respectively, by Zarand Aviation and Kerman Aviation, both of whose corporate registrations list Mahan Air General Trading as a member of their Groupement D'interet Economique ("Economic Interest Group").<sup>7</sup> At the time of the July 1, 2011 and August 24, 2011 Orders, these Airbus A310s were registered in France, with tail numbers F-OJHH and F-OJHI, respectively. OEE subsequently presented evidence that after the August 24, 2011 renewal, Mahan Airways and Zarand Aviation worked in concert, along with Kerman Aviation, to de-register the two Airbus A310 aircraft in France and to register both aircraft in Iran (with, respectively, Iranian tail numbers EP-MHH and EP-MHI). It was determined subsequent to the February 15, 2012 renewal order that the

registration switch for these A310s was cancelled; however, both aircraft continued to actively fly for Mahan Airways under the original French tail numbers.

In addition to Mahan Airways' continued unlawful operation and/or possession of these two A310s, as well as the remaining 747 (MSN 23480 and Iranian tail number EP-MNE) discussed above, the August 2012 renewal order found that Mahan Airways had acquired another Airbus A310 aircraft subject to the Regulations,<sup>8</sup> with MSN 499 and Iranian tail number EP-VIP, in violation of the TDO and the Regulations. On September 19, 2012, all three Airbus A310 aircraft (tail numbers F-OJHH, F-OJHI, and EP-VIP) were designated as SDGTs.<sup>9</sup>

The February 4, 2013 Order laid out further evidence of continued and additional efforts by Mahan Airways and other persons acting in concert with Mahan, including Kral Aviation and another Turkish company, to procure U.S.-origin engines (MSNs 517621 and 517738) and other aircraft parts in violation of the TDO and the Regulations.<sup>10</sup> The February 4, 2013 renewal order also added Mehdi Bahrami as a related person in accordance with Section 766.23 of the Regulations. Bahrami, a Mahan Vice-President and the head of Mahan's Istanbul Office, also was involved in Mahan's acquisition of the original three Boeing 747s (Aircraft 1-3) that resulted in the original TDO, and has had a business relationship with Mahan dating back to 1997.

The July 31, 2013 Order detailed additional evidence obtained by OEE

<sup>8</sup> See note 6, *supra*.

<sup>9</sup> See <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/OFAC-Enforcement/pages/20120919.aspx>. Mahan Airways was previously designated by OFAC as a SDGT on October 18, 2011. 77 FR 64,427 (October 18, 2011).

<sup>10</sup> Kral Aviation was referenced in the February 4, 2013 Order as "Turkish Company No. 1." Kral Aviation purchased a GE CF6-50C2 aircraft engine (MSN517621) from the United States in July 2012, on behalf of Mahan Airways. OEE was able to prevent this engine from reaching Mahan by issuing a redelivery order to the freight forwarder in accordance with Section 758.8 of the Regulations. OEE also issued Kral Aviation a redelivery order for the second CF6-50C2 engine (MSN 517738) on July 30, 2012. The owner of the second engine subsequently cancelled the item's sale to Kral Aviation. In September 2012, OEE was alerted by a U.S. exporter that another Turkish company ("Turkish Company No. 2") was attempting to purchase aircraft spare parts intended for re-export by Turkish Company No. 2 to Mahan Airways. See February 4, 2013 Order.

On December 31, 2013, Kral Aviation was added to BIS's Entity List, Supplement No. 4 to Part 744 of the Regulations. See 78 Fed. Reg. 75458 (Dec. 12, 2013). Companies and individuals are added to the Entity List for engaging in activities contrary to the national security or foreign policy interests of the United States. See 15 CFR § 744.11.

showing efforts by Mahan Airways to obtain another GE CF6-50C2 aircraft engine (MSN 528350) from the United States via Turkey. Multiple Mahan employees, including Mehdi Bahrami, were involved in or aware of matters related to the engine's arrival in Turkey from the United States, plans to visually inspect the engine, and prepare it for shipment from Turkey.

Mahan sought to obtain this U.S.-origin engine through Pioneer Logistics Havacilik Turizm Yonetim Danismanlik ("Pioneer Logistics"), an aircraft parts supplier located in Turkey, and its director/operator, Gulnihal Yegane, a Turkish national who previously has conducted Mahan related business with Mehdi Bahrami and Ali Eslamian. Moreover, as referenced in the July 31, 2013 Order, a sworn affidavit by Kosol Surinanda, also known as Kosol Surinandha, Managing Director of Mahan's General Sales Agent in Thailand, stated that the shares of Pioneer Logistics for which he is the listed owner are "actually the property of and owned by Mahan." He further stated that he held "legal title to the shares until otherwise required by Mahan" but would "exercise the rights granted to [him] exactly and only as instructed by Mahan and [his] vote and/or decisions [would] only and exclusively reflect the wills and demands of Mahan[.]"<sup>11</sup>

OEE's current renewal request includes evidence discovered or obtained after the July 31, 2013 Order was issued that further establishes Mahan's continued efforts to evade and violate the TDO and the Regulations, including through efforts to further expand its network of procurement agents. OEE has obtained evidence confirming an attempt by Mahan, which OEE thwarted, to obtain, via an Indonesian aircraft parts supplier, two U.S.-origin Honeywell ALF-502R-5 aircraft engines (MSNs LF5660 and LF5325), items subject to the Regulations, from a U.S. company located in Texas. An invoice of the Indonesian aircraft parts supplier dated March 27, 2013, lists Mahan Airways as the purchaser of the engines and includes a Mahan ship-to address. OEE also has obtained a Mahan air waybill dated March 12, 2013, listing numerous U.S.-origin aircraft parts, including, but not limited to, a vertical navigation gyroscope, a transmitter, and a power control unit, items subject to the Regulations, being transported by

<sup>11</sup> Pioneer Logistics, Gulnihal Yegane, and Kosol Surinanda also were added to the Entity List on December 12, 2013. See 78 FR 75458 (Dec. 12, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> See <http://www.treasury.gov/resource-center/sanctions/OFAC-Enforcement/pages/20120919.aspx>.

<sup>6</sup> The Airbus A310s are powered with U.S.-origin engines. The engines are subject to the EAR and classified under Export Control Classification ("ECCN") 9A991.d. The Airbus A310s contain controlled U.S.-origin items valued at more than 10 percent of the total value of the aircraft and as a result are subject to the EAR. They are classified under ECCN 9A991.b. The reexport of these aircraft to Iran requires U.S. Government authorization pursuant to Section 746.7 of the Regulations.

<sup>7</sup> Kerman Aviation's corporate registration also lists Mahan Aviation Services Company as an additional member of its Economic Interest Group.

Mahan from Turkey to Iran in violation of the TDO.

Finally, Mahan continues to publically list in its active fleet both U.S.-origin aircraft and aircraft such as the Airbus A310, which, based on its U.S.-origin engines, is subject to the Regulations.

### C. Findings

Under the applicable standard set forth in Section 766.24 of the Regulations and my review of the entire record, I find that the evidence presented by BIS convincingly demonstrates that Mahan Airways has continually violated the EAR and the TDO, that such knowing violations have been significant, deliberate and covert, and that there is a likelihood of future violations. The record includes further evidence uncovered by OEE since the July 31, 2013 Order regarding on-going efforts by Mahan Airways in concert with its far-reaching network of affiliates and agents to procure EAR items in violation of the TDO and the Regulations. Therefore, renewal of the TDO is necessary to prevent imminent violation of the EAR and to give notice to companies and individuals in the United States and abroad that they should continue to cease dealing with Mahan Airways, Zarand Aviation, and the other denied persons under the TDO in export transactions involving items subject to the EAR.

### IV. Order

*It is therefore ordered:*

First, that MAHAN AIRWAYS, Mahan Tower, No. 21, Azadegan St., M.A. Jenah Exp. Way, Tehran, Iran; ZARAND AVIATION A/K/A GIE ZARAND AVIATION, 42 Avenue Montaigne, 75008 Paris, France, and 112 Avenue Kleber, 75116 Paris, France; GATEWICK LLC, A/K/A GATEWICK FREIGHT & CARGO SERVICES, A/K/A GATEWICK AVIATION SERVICE, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; PEJMAN MAHMOOD KOSARAYANIFARD A/K/A KOSARIAN FARD, P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; MAHMOUD AMINI, G#22 Dubai Airport Free Zone, P.O. Box 393754, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and P.O. Box 52404, Dubai, United Arab Emirates, and Mohamed Abdulla Alqaz Building, Al Maktoum Street, Al Rigga, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; KERMAN AVIATION A/K/A GIE KERMAN AVIATION, 42 Avenue Montaigne 75008, Paris, France; SIRJANCO

TRADING LLC, P.O. Box 8709, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; ALI ESLAMIAN, 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London W1G0PW, United Kingdom, and 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road, St. Johns Wood, London NW87RY, United Kingdom; MAHAN AIR GENERAL TRADING LLC, 19th Floor Al Moosa Tower One, Sheik Zayed Road, Dubai 40594, United Arab Emirates; SKYCO (UK) LTD., 4th Floor, 33 Cavendish Square, London, W1G 0PV, United Kingdom; EQUIPCO (UK) LTD., 2 Bentinck Close, Prince Albert Road, London, NW8 7RY, United Kingdom; and MEHDI BAHRAMI, Mahan Airways-Istanbul Office, Cumhuriye Cad. Sibil Apt No: 101 D:6, 34374 Emadad, Sisli Istanbul, Turkey; and when acting for or on their behalf, any successors or assigns, agents, or employees (each a "Denied Person" and collectively the "Denied Persons") may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Export Administration Regulations ("EAR"), or in any other activity subject to the EAR including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR.

SECOND, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of a Denied Person any item subject to the EAR;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by a Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby a Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from a Denied Person of any

item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from a Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the EAR with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by a Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

THIRD, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to a Denied Person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

FOURTH, that this Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the EAR where the only items involved that are subject to the EAR are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

In accordance with the provisions of Sections 766.24(e) of the EAR, Mahan Airways and/or Zarand Aviation may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022. In accordance with the provisions of Sections 766.23(c)(2) and 766.24(e)(3) of the EAR, Gatewick LLC, Mahmoud Amini, Pejman Mahmood Kosarayanifard, Kerman Aviation, Sirjanco Trading LLC, Ali Eslamian, Mahan Air General Trading LLC, Skyco (UK) Ltd., Equipco (UK) Ltd., and/or Mehdi Bahrami may, at any time, appeal their inclusion as a related person by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request not later than 20 days before the expiration date. A renewal request may be opposed by Mahan Airways and/or Zarand Aviation as

provided in Section 766.24(d), by filing a written submission with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement, which must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

A copy of this Order shall be provided to Mahan Airways, Zarand Aviation and each related person, and shall be published in the **Federal Register**. This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Dated: January 24, 2014.

**David W. Mills,**

*Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.*

[FR Doc. 2014-01835 Filed 1-29-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-898]

#### **Chlorinated Isocyanurates from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012**

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

**SUMMARY:** On July 10, 2013, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published its *Preliminary Results* of the 2011-2012 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on chlorinated isocyanurates (chloro isos) from the People's Republic of China (PRC).<sup>1</sup> The period of review (POR) is June 1, 2011, through May 31, 2012. This review covers six producers/exporters of subject merchandise: (1) Arch Chemicals (China) Co. Ltd. (Arch China); (2) Hebei Jiheng Chemical Co., Ltd. and Hebei Jiheng Baikang Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. (collectively, Jiheng); (3) Heze Huayi Chemical Co. Ltd. (Heze); (4) Juancheng Kantgai Chemical Co., Ltd. (collectively, Kangtai); (5) Sinocarbon International Trading Co., Ltd. (Sinocarbon); and (6) Zhucheng Taisheng Chemical Co., Ltd. (Zhucheng). Jiheng and Kangtai are the mandatory respondents. We invited parties to comment on our *Preliminary Results*. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we made certain changes to our margin calculations for Jiheng and Kangtai. The final dumping

margins for this review are listed in the "Final Results" section below.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* January 30, 2014.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sean Cary or Emily Halle, 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) 482-3964 or (202) 482-0176, respectively.

#### **Background**

On July 10, 2013, the Department published its *Preliminary Results*. On August 9, 2013, Jiheng and Kangtai each submitted a hearing request to address issues raised in their case and rebuttal case briefs. On August 15, 2013, the Department extended the deadline for the final results in this administrative review until January 6, 2014.<sup>2</sup> The Department conducted a verification of Kangtai between September 23 and September 27, 2013.<sup>3</sup> On November 29, 2013, Clearon Corporation and Occidental Chemical Corporation (collectively, Petitioners), Jiheng, and Kangtai each submitted a case brief.<sup>4</sup> On December 4 and 5, 2013, Jiheng, Petitioners, and Kangtai each submitted a rebuttal case brief.<sup>5</sup> On January 7, 2014, we held a public hearing to address issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs.<sup>6</sup>

As explained in the memorandum from the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, the Department has exercised its discretion to toll deadlines for the duration of the

<sup>2</sup> See Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, "Chlorinated Isocyanurates from the People's Republic of China: Extension of Deadline for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review," (August 15, 2013).

<sup>3</sup> See Memorandum to the File, "Verification of the Sales and Factors Response of Juancheng Kantgai Chemical Co., Ltd. in the Antidumping Review of Chlorinated Isocyanurates from the People's Republic of China," (November 29, 2013).

<sup>4</sup> See "Case Brief of Clearon Corp. and Occidental Chemical Corporation," (November 29, 2013); "Chlorinated Isocyanurates from China (Seventh Administrative Review)—Hebei Jiheng Chemical Co., Ltd. Case Brief," (November 29, 2013) and; "Chlorinated Isocyanurates from the People's Republic of China Kangtai Case Brief," (November 29, 2013).

<sup>5</sup> See "Chlorinated Isocyanurates from China (Seventh Administrative Review)—Hebei Jiheng Chemical Co., Ltd. Rebuttal Brief," (December 4, 2013); "Rebuttal Brief of Clearon Corp. and Occidental Chemical Corporation," (December 5, 2013); and "Chlorinated Isocyanurates from the People's Republic of China Kangtai Rebuttal Brief," (December 5, 2013).

<sup>6</sup> See "Public Hearing in the Matter of: Administrative Review under the Antidumping Duty Order on Chlorinated Isocyanurates from the People's Republic of China," (January 7, 2014).

closure of the Federal Government from October 1, 2013, through October 16, 2013.<sup>7</sup> Therefore, all deadlines in this segment of the proceeding were extended by 16 days. Therefore, the revised deadline for the final results of this review is January 22, 2014.

#### **Scope of the Order**

The products covered by the order are chlorinated isos, which are derivatives of cyanuric acid, described as chlorinated s-triazine triones. Chlorinated isos are currently classifiable under subheadings 2933.69.6015, 2933.69.6021, 2933.69.6050, 3808.40.50, 3808.50.40 and 3808.94.5000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States.<sup>8</sup>

#### **Final Determination of No Shipments**

For these final results of review, we continue to find that Heze had no shipments during the POR.<sup>9</sup>

#### **Analysis of Comments Received**

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs filed by parties in this review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum, which is hereby adopted by this notice. A list of the issues that parties raised and to which we responded in the Issues and Decision Memorandum follows as an appendix to this notice. 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 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/>. The paper copy and electronic version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

#### **Changes Since the Preliminary Results**

Based on a review of the record and comments received from interested parties regarding our *Preliminary*

<sup>7</sup> See Memorandum for the Record from Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, "Deadlines Affected by the Shutdown of the Federal Government," (October 18, 2013).

<sup>8</sup> See Memorandum to Christian Marsh, Acting Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, "Chlorinated Isocyanurates from the People's Republic of China: Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the 2011-2012 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review," issued concurrently with this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum) for a complete description of the scope of the Order.

<sup>9</sup> See *Preliminary Results*, 78 FR 41364.

<sup>1</sup> See Chlorinated Isocyanurates From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2011-2012, 78 FR 41364 (July 10, 2013) (*Preliminary Results*).