

military aircraft to a foreign government may agree to offset the cost of the aircraft by providing training assistance to plant managers in the purchasing country. Although this distorts the true price of the aircraft, the foreign government may require this sort of extra compensation as a condition of awarding the contract to purchase the aircraft. As described in the regulations, U.S. companies are required to report information on contracts for the sale of defense articles or defense services to foreign countries or foreign companies that are subject to offsets agreements exceeding \$5,000,000 in value. U.S. companies are also required to report annually information on offsets transactions completed in performance of existing offsets commitments for which offsets credit of \$250,000 or more has been claimed from the foreign representative.

Commerce's annual report to Congress includes an aggregated summary of the data reported by industry in accordance with the offsets regulation and the DPA (50 U.S.C. 4568 (2015)). As provided by section 723(c) of the DPA, BIS will not publicly disclose individual company information it receives through offsets reporting unless the company furnishing the information specifically authorizes public disclosure. The information collected is sorted and organized into an aggregate report of national offsets data, and therefore does not identify company-specific information.

In order to enable BIS to prepare the next annual offset report reflecting calendar year 2016 data, affected U.S. companies must submit the required information on offsets agreements and offsets transactions from calendar year 2016 to BIS no later than June 15, 2017.

Dated: June 6, 2017.

Matthew S. Borman,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Export Administration.

[FR Doc. 2017-11981 Filed 6-8-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-JT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-821-802]

Uranium From the Russian Federation; Final Results of the Expedited Fourth Sunset Review of the Suspension Agreement

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 termination of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation (Suspension Agreement) and the suspended investigation would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. The magnitude of the dumping margin likely to prevail is indicated in the "Final Results of Review" section of this notice.

DATES: Effective June 9, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Sally C. Gannon or Jill Buckles, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0162 or (202) 482-6230, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 3, 2017, the Department published the notice of initiation of the fourth sunset review of the Suspension Agreement and suspended antidumping duty investigation on uranium from the Russian Federation, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).¹ Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i), the Department received timely and complete notices of intent to participate in this sunset reviews from Louisiana Energy Services, LLC (LES), Power Resources, Inc. (PRI) and Crow Butte Resources, Inc. (Crow Butte), and Centrus Energy Corp. and United States Enrichment Corporation (USEC) (collectively, Centrus) on February 21, 2017, and from ConverDyn on February 24, 2017. On March 6, 2017, the Department received complete substantive responses from LES, PRI and Crow Butte, and Centrus (collectively, the domestic interested parties) within the 30-day period specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i).² The Department did not receive substantive responses from any respondent interested party. 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

¹ See *Initiation of Five-Year ("Sunset") Reviews*, 82 FR 9193 (February 3, 2017) (*Initiation*).

² See "Uranium from Russia: Louisiana Energy Services, LLC's Substantive Response to the Notice of Initiation" from Louisiana Energy Services dated March 6, 2017; "Uranium from the Russian Federation: Substantive Response to the Notice of Initiation" from Power Resources and Crow Butte Resources dated March 6, 2017; "Uranium from the Russian Federation: Substantive Response to Notice of Initiation of Five-Year Review" from Centrus Energy Corp. and United States Enrichment Corporation dated March 6, 2017.

sunset review of this Suspension Agreement.

Scope of the Agreement

The product covered by the Suspension Agreement is natural uranium in the form of uranium ores and concentrates; natural uranium metal and natural uranium compounds; alloys, dispersions (including cermet), ceramic products, and mixtures containing natural uranium or natural uranium compounds; uranium enriched in U²³⁵ and its compounds; alloys, dispersions (including cermet), ceramic products, and mixtures containing uranium enriched in U²³⁵ or compounds of uranium enriched in U²³⁵; and any other forms of uranium within the same class or kind.

Uranium ore from Russia that is milled into U₃O₈ and/or converted into UF₆ in another country prior to direct and/or indirect importation into the United States is considered uranium from Russia and is subject to the terms of this Suspension Agreement.

For purposes of this Suspension Agreement, uranium enriched in U²³⁵ or compounds of uranium enriched in U²³⁵ in Russia are covered by this Suspension Agreement, regardless of their subsequent modification or blending. Uranium enriched in U²³⁵ in another country prior to direct and/or indirect importation into the United States is not considered uranium from Russia and is not subject to the terms of this Suspension Agreement.³

HEU is within the scope of the underlying investigation, and HEU is covered by this Suspension Agreement. For the purpose of this Suspension Agreement, HEU means uranium enriched to 20 percent or greater in the isotope uranium-235.

Imports of uranium ores and concentrates, natural uranium compounds, and all forms of enriched uranium are currently classifiable under the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS) subheadings: 2612.10.00, 2844.10.20, 2844.20.00, respectively. Imports of natural uranium metal and forms of natural uranium other than compounds are currently classifiable under HTSUS subheadings: 2844.10.10 and 2844.10.50. HTSUS

³ The second amendment of two amendments to the Suspension Agreement effective on October 3, 1996, in part included within the scope of the Suspension Agreement for Russian uranium which had been enriched in a third country prior to importation into the United States. According to the amendment, this modification remained in effect until October 3, 1998. See *Amendments to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation*, 61 FR 56665, 56667 (November 4, 1996).

subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in this sunset review, including the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the Suspension Agreement is terminated, are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.⁴ 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 (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <http://access.trade.gov> and is available in the Central Records Unit, room B8024 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>.

Final Results of Review

Pursuant to section 752(c) of the Act, the Department determines that termination of the Suspension Agreement and suspended investigation on uranium from the Russian Federation would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping, and that the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the suspension agreement is terminated would be 115.82 percent.

Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Order

This notice also serves as the only 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. 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 violation subject to sanction.

Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing these results and notice in accordance with

⁴ See Memorandum from Sally C. Gannon, Director for Bilateral Agreements, to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, "Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Fourth Sunset Review of the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation; Final Results," (June 5, 2017) (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

sections 751(c), 752(c), and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218.

Dated: June 5, 2017.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2017-11987 Filed 6-8-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-475-818]

Certain Pasta From Italy: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review

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

SUMMARY: On March 17, 2017, the Department of Commerce (Department) published the preliminary results of the changed circumstances review (CCR) of the antidumping duty order on certain pasta from Italy and preliminarily determined that Francesco Tamma S.p.A. (Tamma) is not the successor-in-interest to Tamma Industrie Alimentari Capitanata S.r.l. (TIAC), the company affiliated with Delverde, S.r.l. (Delverde), which was excluded from the order on pasta from Italy. We received comments from interested parties. Based on our analysis, for the final results, the Department continues to find that Tamma is not the successor-in-interest to TIAC.

DATES: Effective June 9, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Joy Zhang, Office III, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-1168.

Background

On July 24, 1996, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on pasta from Italy, which included Delverde and its affiliate TIAC (collectively, Delverde/TIAC).¹ Pursuant to a decision by the Court of International Trade, on remand, the Department determined that Delverde/TIAC had a *de minimis* dumping margin and should be excluded from the order on pasta from Italy.² In accordance with a decision

¹ See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Order and Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Pasta from Italy*, 61 FR 38547 (July 24, 1996) (*Pasta Order*).

² See *Notice of Amendment of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*

from the World Trade Organization (WTO), the United States Trade Representative subsequently directed the Department to revise the all-others rate for the *Pasta Order* to 15.45 percent *ad valorem*.³

In 2014, the Department conducted a CCR of Delverde Industrie Alimentari S.p.A. (Delverde S.p.A.) and found that Delverde S.p.A. was not the successor-in-interest to Delverde based on aspects of the bankruptcy of Delverde, changes in management, changes in supplier relationships, and changes in production facilities.⁴ Thus, the Department found that Delverde S.p.A. was not entitled to the exclusion from the *Pasta Order* that was originally granted to Delverde, a defunct entity.⁵

On July 29, 2016, American Italian Pasta Company, Dakota Growers Pasta Company, and New World Pasta Company (the petitioners) filed a request for the Department to initiate a CCR of Tamma to determine whether Tamma is the successor-in-interest to TIAC, the company excluded from the *Pasta Order* that was previously affiliated with the now defunct Delverde.⁶ On September 13, 2016, we initiated a CCR with respect to Tamma.⁷

On March 21, 2017, the Department issued the *Preliminary Results* of this CCR, in which it determined that Tamma is not the successor-in-interest to TIAC, the company in the Delverde/TIAC entity, which was excluded from the *Pasta Order*.⁸

Pursuant to Court Decision and Revocation in Part: Certain Pasta from Italy, 66 FR 65889 (December 21, 2001).

³ See *Implementation of the Findings of the WTO Panel in US—Zeroing (EC): Notice of Determinations Under Section 129 of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act and Revocations and Partial Revocations of Certain Antidumping Duty Orders*, 72 FR 25261, 25263 (May 4, 2007) (*Pasta Section 129 Implementation Determination*).

⁴ See *Certain Pasta from Italy: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 79 FR 28481 (May 16, 2014); unchanged in *Certain Pasta from Italy: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 79 FR 76339 (September 19, 2014) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum (*Delverde CCR*).

⁵ See *Delverde CCR*.

⁶ See Petitioners' letter titled, "Request for 2015-2016 Administrative Reviews of the Antidumping Duty Order on Certain Pasta from Italy," dated July 29, 2016. This letter requests an administrative review and changed circumstances review of Tamma. On August 11, 2016, the petitioners refiled this review request to clarify the specific company names requested for review.

⁷ See *Certain Pasta from Italy: Initiation of Changed Circumstances Review*, 81 FR 62864 (September 13, 2016) (*Initiation Notice*).

⁸ See *Certain Pasta from Italy: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 82 FR 14501 (March 21, 2017) (*Preliminary Results*) and the accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum.