

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we calculated importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rates based on the ratio of the total amount of dumping calculated for the importer's examined sales to the total entered value of those sales. Where the assessment rate is above *de minimis*, we will instruct CBP to assess duties on all entries of subject merchandise by that importer. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2), we will instruct CBP to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties any entries for which the assessment rate is *de minimis* (*i.e.*, less than 0.50 percent).

The Department clarified its "automatic assessment" regulation on May 6, 2003.<sup>16</sup> This clarification applies to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by companies examined in this review (*i.e.*, companies for which a dumping margin was calculated) where the companies did not know that their merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate unreviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.

#### Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of these final results of administrative review for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For companies covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the rates listed above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies other than those covered by this review, the cash deposit rate will be the company-specific rate established for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation, but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the producer of the subject merchandise; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the producer is a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original investigation, the cash deposit rate will be 3.91 percent, the all-others rate established in the original investigation.<sup>17</sup> These cash deposit

<sup>16</sup> For a full discussion of this clarification, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

<sup>17</sup> See *CLPP Order*.

requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

#### Notification to Importers Regarding the Reimbursement of Duties

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping and/or countervailing duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during the POR. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping and/or countervailing duties occurred and the subsequent increase in antidumping duties by the amount of antidumping and/or countervailing duties reimbursed.

#### Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under 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/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.

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

Dated: April 30, 2014.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

#### Appendix

- I. Summary
- II. List of Comments in the Accompanying Final Issues and Decision Memorandum:
  - Comment 1: Whether Navneet's Claim for Duty Drawback Adjustments Are Valid
  - Comment 2: Calculation Error Regarding Navneet's Drawback Credits
  - Comment 3: Whether Navneet's Early Payment Discounts and Other Rebates Claims for Home Market Sales Are Valid
- III. Background
- IV. The Proper Rate To Apply to AR Printing, the Non-Selected Respondent
- V. Scope of the Order
- VI. Analysis of Comments
- VII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2014-10519 Filed 5-6-14; 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: Final Results of Expedited Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

**SUMMARY:** As a result of this sunset review, the Department of Commerce (the Department) finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order on refined brown aluminum oxide (RBAO) from the People's Republic of China (PRC) would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. The magnitude of the dumping margins likely to prevail is indicated in the "Final Results of Sunset Review" section of this notice.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* May 7, 2014.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Terre Keaton Stefanova or David Goldberger, AD/CVD Operations, Office II, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1280 or (202) 482-4136, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On November 19, 2003, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on RBAO from the PRC.<sup>1</sup> On February 3, 2014, the Department published the notice of initiation of the second sunset review of the antidumping duty order on RBAO from the PRC pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act.<sup>2</sup> On February 14, 2014, the Department received a Notice of Intent to Participate from the following domestic producers of RBAO: C-E Minerals, Inc., Imerys Fused Minerals Niagara Falls, Inc., U.S. Electrofused Minerals, Inc., and Washington Mills Group, Inc. (collectively "the domestic interested parties"), within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act, as manufacturers of

<sup>1</sup> See *Antidumping Duty Order: Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide (Otherwise Known as Refined Brown Artificial Corundum or Brown Fused Alumina) From the People's Republic of China*, 68 FR 65249 (November 19, 2003).

<sup>2</sup> See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Review*, 79 FR 6163 (February 3, 2014).

a domestic like product in the United States. We received a complete substantive response from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). We received no substantive responses from any respondent interested parties. As a result, pursuant to section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the order.

### 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. 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 numbers are provided for convenience and for customs purposes, the written description of the merchandise is dispositive.<sup>3</sup>

### Analysis of Comments Received

A complete discussion of all issues raised in this review is provided in the accompanying Decision Memo. The issues discussed in the Decision Memo include the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail if the order were to be revoked. The Decision Memo is a public document and is on file electronically via Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (IA ACCESS). Access to IA ACCESS is available in the Central Records Unit, Room 7046 of the main Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Decision Memo can be accessed directly at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/>. The signed and electronic versions of the Decision Memo are identical in content.

### Final Results of Sunset Review

We determine that revocation of the antidumping duty order on RBAO from the PRC would be likely to lead to

<sup>3</sup> For a complete description of the Scope of the Order, see Memorandum to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations, titled "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Expedited Second Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Refined Brown Aluminum Oxide from the People's Republic of China," dated concurrently with and adopted by this notice (Decision Memo).

continuation or recurrence of dumping at the following weighted-average percentage margins:

Manufacturers/exporters/producers	Weighted-average margin (percent)
Zibo Jinyu Abrasive Co., Ltd	135.18
PRC-wide .....	135.18

### Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative an 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 results and notice in accordance with sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 30, 2014.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary, for Enforcement and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2014-10516 Filed 5-6-14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-929]

#### Small Diameter Graphite Electrodes From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

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

**SUMMARY:** On January 2, 2014, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the initiation of the first sunset review of the antidumping duty order on small diameter graphite electrodes from the People's Republic of China (PRC) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The Department finds that revocation of this antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping as indicated in the "Final Results of Sunset Review" section of this notice.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* May 7, 2014.

### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael A. Romani or Minoo Hatten, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0198 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Background

On February 26, 2009, the Department published the antidumping duty order on small diameter graphite electrodes from the PRC.<sup>1</sup> On January 2, 2014, the Department published the notice of initiation of the sunset review of the *Antidumping Duty Order*.<sup>2</sup> The Department received a notice of intent to participate in this sunset review from GrafTech USA LLC, SGL Carbon LLC, and Superior Graphite Company (collectively, domestic interested parties), within the 15-day period specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). The domestic interested parties claimed interested party status under section 771(9)(C) of the Act as producers of the domestic like product.

The Department received an adequate substantive response to the *Initiation* from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day period specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). The Department received no substantive response from respondent interested parties. In accordance with section 751(c)(3)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C)(2), the Department conducted an expedited (120-day) sunset review of the *Antidumping Duty Order*.

#### Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the order includes all small diameter graphite electrodes with a nominal or actual diameter of 400 millimeters (16 inches) or less and graphite pin joining systems for small diameter graphite electrodes. Small diameter graphite electrodes and graphite pin joining systems for small diameter graphite electrodes that are subject to the order are currently classified under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings 8545.11.0010, 3801.10, and 8545.11.0020. While the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the

<sup>1</sup> See *Antidumping Duty Order: Small Diameter Graphite Electrodes from the People's Republic of China*, 74 FR 8775 (February 26, 2009) (*Antidumping Duty Order*).

<sup>2</sup> See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 79 FR 110 (January 2, 2014) (*Initiation*).