

satisfactorily, there must be written guides and rules, which in this case are regulations for the provider and user.

Need and Use of the Information: The Agricultural Marketing Service will collect information to ensure that the dairy inspection program products are produced under sanitary conditions and buyers are purchasing a quality product. The information collected through recordkeeping are routinely reviewed and evaluated during the inspection of the dairy plant facilities for USDA approval. Without laboratory testing results required by recordkeeping, the inspectors would not be able to evaluate the quality of dairy products.

Description of Respondents: Business or other for-profit.

Number of Respondents: 487.

Frequency of Responses: Recordkeeping.

Total Burden Hours: 1,388.

Charlene Parker,

Departmental Information Collection Clearance Officer.

[FR Doc. 2015-05998 Filed 3-16-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-02-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-929]

Small Diameter Graphite Electrodes From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2013-2014

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

SUMMARY: On November 19, 2014, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on small diameter graphite electrodes from the People's Republic of China (PRC), covering the period February 1, 2013, through January 31, 2014.¹ We invited parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. We received no comments from interested parties. Accordingly, for the final results, we continue to find that during the period of review (POR) Henan Sanli Carbon Products Co., Ltd. (Henan Sanli) made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 17, 2015.

¹ See *Small Diameter Graphite Electrodes From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: 2013-2014*, 79 FR 68856 (November 19, 2014) (*Preliminary Results*) and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (*Preliminary Decision Memorandum*).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Michael A. Romani, 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.

Background

On November 19, 2014, the Department published the *Preliminary Results* of this review. The Department gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the *Preliminary Results*.² We received no comments from interested parties.

We conducted this review in accordance with sections 751(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the order includes all small diameter graphite electrodes of any length, whether or not finished, of a kind used in furnaces, with a nominal or actual diameter of 400 millimeters (16 inches) or less, and whether or not attached to a graphite pin joining system or any other type of joining system or hardware. The merchandise covered by the order also includes graphite pin joining systems for small diameter graphite electrodes, of any length, whether or not finished, of a kind used in furnaces, and whether or not the graphite pin joining system is attached to, sold with, or sold separately from, the small diameter graphite electrode. Small diameter graphite electrodes and graphite pin joining systems for small diameter graphite electrodes are most commonly used in primary melting, ladle metallurgy, and specialty furnace applications in industries including foundries, smelters, and steel refining operations. 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 8545.11.0010,³ 3801.10,⁴

² *Id.* at 68857.

³ The scope described in the order refers to the HTSUS subheading 8545.11.0000. We note that, starting in 2010, imports of small diameter graphite electrodes are classified in the HTSUS under subheading 8545.11.0010 and imports of large diameter graphite electrodes are classified under subheading 8545.11.0020.

⁴ HTSUS subheading 3801.10 was added to the scope of the *SDGE Order* based on a determination in *Small Diameter Graphite Electrodes From the People's Republic of China: Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order*, 77 FR 47596 (August 9, 2012) (first circumvention determination). The products covered by the first circumvention

and 8545.11.0020.⁵ The HTSUS numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, but the written description of the scope is dispositive.

Final Results of Review

The Department made no changes to its *Preliminary Results*. As a result, the Department determines that Henan Sanli is not entitled to a separate rate and should remain part of the PRC-wide entity.⁶ The rate previously established for the PRC-wide entity in this proceeding is 159.64 percent.⁷

Assessment

The Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review.⁸ Consistent with our determination that Henan Sanli is part of the PRC-wide entity, we will instruct CBP to apply an *ad valorem* assessment rate of 159.64 percent to all entries of subject merchandise during the POR which were exported by Henan Sanli.

The Department intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of review.

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for shipments of the subject merchandise from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse,

determination are SDGE (or graphite pin joining system) that were 1) produced by UK Carbon and Graphite Co., Ltd. (UKCG) from PRC-manufactured artificial/synthetic graphite forms, of a size and shape (e.g., blanks, rods, cylinders, billets, blocks, etc.); 2) which required additional machining processes (i.e., tooling and shaping) that UKCG performed in the United Kingdom (UK), and 3) were re-exported to the United States as UK-origin merchandise.

⁵ HTSUS subheading 8545.11.0020 was added to the scope of the *SDGE Order* based on a determination in *Small Diameter Graphite Electrodes from the People's Republic of China: Affirmative Final Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order and Rescission of Later-Developed Merchandise Anticircumvention Inquiry*, 78 FR 56864 (September 16, 2013) (second circumvention determination). The products covered by the second circumvention determination are SDGE produced and/or exported by Jilin Carbon Import and Export Company with an actual or nominal diameter of 17 inches.

⁶ Pursuant to the Department's change in practice, the Department no longer considers the non-market economy entity as an exporter conditionally subject to administrative reviews. See *Preliminary Results* at note 3 and *Preliminary Decision Memorandum* at 4.

⁷ See *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances: Small Diameter Graphite Electrodes from the People's Republic of China*, 74 FR 2049, 2053-54 (January 14, 2009).

⁸ See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the existing exporter-specific rate; (2) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, including Henan Sanli, the cash deposit rate will be that for the PRC-wide entity; and (3) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporter that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These cash deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a final reminder to 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 POR. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Orders

This notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to 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 or 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 sanctionable violation.

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

Dated: March 10, 2015.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015-06105 Filed 3-16-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-924]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Administrative Review Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On February 27, 2015 the United States Court of International Trade ("CIT") sustained the Department of Commerce's ("the Department") final results of remand redetermination, pursuant to the CIT's remand order, in *DuPont Teijin Films China Limited, et al. v. United States*, Slip Op. 15-19 (CIT February 27, 2015).¹

Consistent with the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit ("CAFC") in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337 (Fed. Cir. 1990) ("*Timken*"), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) ("*Diamond Sawblades*"), the Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department's *PET Film Final Results*² and is amending the final results with respect to DuPont Teijin Film China Limited Co., Ltd. ("DuPont") and Tianjin Wanhua Co., Ltd. ("Wanhua") for the period of review from November 1, 2010, through October 31, 2011.

DATES: *Effective Date:* March 9, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Martin, Office IV, Enforcement & Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3936.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On June 12, 2013, the Department published the *PET Film Final Results*.

¹ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, Court No. 13-00229, dated January 9, 2015, available at: <http://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/index.html> ("*PET Film Final Remand*"); see also *DuPont Teijin Films China Limited, et al. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 13-00229, Slip Op. 15-19 (CIT 2015) ("*Remand Opinion and Order*").

² See *Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2010-2011*, 78 FR 35245 (June 12, 2013) ("*PET Film Final Results*").

Interested parties DuPont, DuPont Hongji Films Foshan Co., Ltd., DuPont Teijin Hongji Films Ningbo Co., Ltd., DuPont Teijin Films U.S. Limited Partnership, and Wanhua, appealed the *PET Film Final Results* to the CIT. On September 11, 2014, the CIT remanded several issues with respect to the *PET Film Final Results*.³ Specifically, the CIT held that: (1) The Department's approach of valuing DuPont's recycled Polyethylene Terephthalate ("PET") chips factor of production, while denying its by-product offset for recyclable PET waste, was unreasonable because it resulted in double-counting, and the Department must "reconsider its approach, and adopt a methodology that does not result in double-counting costs, insofar as reasonably avoidable;" and (2) the Department's brokerage and handling calculation for DuPont "incorrectly assumes that a shipment weighing less will incur lower document preparation and customs clearance costs, while a shipment weighing more will incur higher preparation costs," and that the brokerage and handling figure therefore required "recalculation."⁴ The CIT also held that because Wanhua's separate rate was based on DuPont's rate, "any change to DuPont's margin following remand shall be applied to Wanhua's rate as well."⁵

Pursuant to the CIT's remand instructions, the Department re-examined record evidence and made the following changes. The Department revised its calculation of DuPont's margin in two ways. First, the Department reopened the record to allow DuPont an opportunity to substantiate its by-product offset, and granted that offset. Second, the Department adjusted DuPont's brokerage and handling surrogate value calculation by dividing the surrogate value for document preparation and customs clearance costs by the weight of DuPont's shipments. In addition, the Department revised its calculation of Wanhua's separate rate by adjusting it for any changes to DuPont's margin, given that its margin was solely based on DuPont's margin.

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*, 893 F.2d at 341, as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*, the CAFC held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("Act"), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that

³ See *DuPont Teijin Films China Ltd. v. United States*, 7 F. Supp. 3d 1338 (CIT 2014).

⁴ *Id.* at 1347-51.

⁵ *Id.* at 1359.