

otherwise sensitive or protected information.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Requests for additional information or specific questions related to collection activities should be directed to Mark Crace, IC Liaison, Bureau of Industry and Security by email at mark.crace@bis.doc.gov or by phone at 202-482-8093.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Abstract

This information collection is necessary to support the execution of the President's priorities and allocations authority under the Defense Production Act of 1950 (DPA), as amended (50 U.S.C. 4501, *et seq.*), and the priorities authorities under the Selective Service Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 3801, *et seq.*), as implemented by the Defense Priorities and Allocations System (DPAS) regulation (15 CFR part 700). The purpose of this authority is to ensure preferential acceptance and performance of contracts and orders supporting national defense and emergency preparedness program requirements.

II. Method of Collection

Submitted electronically or in paper form.

III. Data

OMB Control Number: 0694-0092.

Form Number(s): None.

Type of Review: Regular submission, extension of a current information collection.

Affected Public: Business or other for-profit organizations.

Estimated Number of Respondents: 14,434,650.

Estimated Time per Response: 2 minute to 16 minutes.

Estimated Total Annual Burden Hours: 45,290.

Estimated Total Annual Cost to Public: \$1,585,150.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

Legal Authority: Defense Production Act of 1950 (DPA).

IV. Request for Comments

We are soliciting public comments to permit the Department/Bureau to: (a) Evaluate whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper functions of the Department, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) Evaluate the accuracy of our estimate of the time and cost burden for this proposed collection, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used; (c) Evaluate ways to enhance the quality,

utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) Minimize the reporting burden on those who are to respond, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Comments that you submit in response to this notice are a matter of public record. We will include or summarize each comment in our request to OMB to approve this ICR. Before including your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, you should be aware that your entire comment—including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you may ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Sheleen Dumas,

Department PRA Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Commerce Department.

[FR Doc. 2020-20206 Filed 9-15-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-33-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-588-874]

Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products From Japan: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Final Determination of No Shipments; 2017-2018

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (Commerce) determines that mandatory respondents, Nippon Steel Corporation (NSC) and Tokyo Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Tokyo Steel), producers and exporters of hot-rolled steel flat products (hot-rolled steel) from Japan, did not sell subject merchandise in the United States at prices below normal value during the period of review (POR) October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018. In addition, Commerce determines that Honda Trading Canada, Inc. (Honda) had no shipments during the POR.

DATES: Applicable September 16, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jun Jack Zhao or Myrna Lobo, AD/CVD Operations, Office VII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone:

(202) 482-1396 or (202) 482-2371, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 16, 2019, Commerce published the *Preliminary Results* of this review in the **Federal Register**.¹ We invited interested parties to comment on the *Preliminary Results*. Between January 15 and January 24, 2020, Commerce received timely filed briefs and rebuttal briefs from the petitioners,² NSC, and Tokyo Steel.³ On January 15, 2020, Commerce received hearing requests from the petitioners and NSC.⁴ In lieu of a hearing, Commerce held a phone meeting with the petitioners on July 17, 2020; NSC did not request a phone meeting in lieu of a hearing.⁵

On March 20, 2020, we extended the deadline for the final results.⁶ On April 24, 2020, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by 50 days.⁷ On July 21, 2020, Commerce tolled all deadlines in administrative reviews by

¹ See *Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Preliminary Determination of No Shipments; 2017-2018*, 84 FR 68402 (December 16, 2019) (*Preliminary Results*), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM).

² The petitioners are AK Steel Corporation; ArcelorMittal USA LLC; Nucor Corporation; SSAB Enterprises, LLC; Steel Dynamics, Inc.; and United States Steel Corporation.

³ See Petitioners' Letter, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Case Brief," dated January 15, 2020; see also NSC's Letter, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: NSC's Case Brief," dated January 15, 2020; Petitioners' Letter, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Petitioner's Rebuttal Brief," dated January 24, 2020; NSC's Letter, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: NSC's Rebuttal Brief," dated January 24, 2020; and Tokyo Steel's Letter, "Rebuttal Brief of Tokyo Steel: Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan," dated January 24, 2020.

⁴ See Petitioners' Letter, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Hearing Request," dated January 15, 2020; see also NSC's Letter, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: NSC's Hearing Request," dated January 15, 2020.

⁵ See Memorandum, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Products from Japan: Phone Meeting with the Petitioners," dated July 17, 2020. The petitioners withdrew their hearing request on July 16, 2020; see Petitioners' Letter, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Withdrawal of Hearing Request," dated July 16, 2020. NSC did not request a phone meeting with Commerce, in lieu of a hearing; see Memorandum, "Administrative Review of Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Contact with NSC Counsel," dated August 27, 2020.

⁶ See Memoranda, "Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Products from Japan: Extension of Deadline for Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2017-2018," dated March 20, 2020.

⁷ See Memorandum, "Tolling of Deadlines for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews in Response to Operational Adjustments Due to COVID-19," dated April 24, 2020.

an additional 60 days.⁸ The deadline for the final results of this review is now September 22, 2020.

These final results cover 25 producers and exporters of subject merchandise.⁹ Based on an analysis of the comments received, we have made changes to the weighted-average dumping margins determined for the respondents. The weighted-average dumping margins are listed in the “Final Results of Review” section. Commerce conducted this review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by the Order is certain hot-rolled steel flat products. For a complete description of the scope of the Order, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.¹⁰

Final Determination of No Shipments

In the Preliminary Results, Commerce preliminarily determined that Honda Trading Canada, Inc. (Honda) had no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) subsequently confirmed Honda had no shipments.¹¹ As no party has identified any record evidence which would call into question these preliminary findings with respect to Honda, we continue to find that Honda made no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. Accordingly, consistent with our practice, we intend to instruct CBP to

liquidate any existing entries of subject merchandise produced by Honda, but exported by other parties without their own rate, at the all-others rate.¹²

Analysis of Comments Received

We addressed all issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. The issues are identified in Appendix I 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 (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <https://access.trade.gov>. 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 Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our review and analysis of the comments received from parties, we made certain changes to the margin calculations for both NSC and Tokyo Steel. For a discussion of these changes, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

Rate for Non-Examined Companies

The statute and Commerce’s regulations do not address the

establishment of a rate to be applied to companies not selected for individual examination when Commerce limits its examination in an administrative review pursuant to section 777A(c)(2) of the Act. Generally, Commerce looks to section 735(c)(5) of the Act, which provides instructions for calculating the all-others rate in a market economy investigation, for guidance when calculating the rate for companies which were not selected for individual examination in an administrative review. Under section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act, the all-others rate is normally “an amount equal to the weighted-average of the estimated weighted-average dumping margins established for exporters and producers individually investigated, excluding any zero or *de minimis* margins, and any margins determined entirely {on the basis of facts available}.”

In this review, we have calculated weighted-average dumping margins for NSC and Tokyo Steel that are zero. Accordingly, we have assigned to the companies not individually examined a margin of 0.00 percent.

Final Results of Review

We are assigning the following weighted-average dumping margins to the firms listed below for the period October 1, 2017 through September 30, 2018:

Producers/exporters	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
Nippon Steel Corporation/Nippon Steel Nisshin Co., Ltd./Nippon Steel Trading Corporation ¹³	0.00
Tokyo Steel Manufacturing Co., Ltd	0.00
Review-Specific Average Rate Applicable to the Following Companies:	
Hanwa Co., Ltd	0.00
Higuchi Manufacturing America, LLC	0.00
Higuchi Seisakusho Co., Ltd	0.00
Hitachi Metals, Ltd	0.00
JFE Steel Corporation/JFE Shoji Trade Corporation ¹⁴	0.00
JFE Shoji Trade America	0.00
Kanematsu Corporation	0.00
Kobe Steel, Ltd	0.00

⁸ See Memorandum, “Tolling of Deadlines for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews,” dated July 21, 2020.

⁹ See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 83 FR 63615 (December 11, 2018).

¹⁰ See Memorandum, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: 2017–2018,” dated concurrently with, and hereby adopted by, this notice (Issues and Decision Memorandum).

¹¹ See Memorandum, “No Shipment Inquiry with Respect to the Company Below During the Period 10/01/2017 through 09/30/2018,” dated December 10, 2019.

¹² See, e.g., *Magnesium Metal from the Russian Federation: Preliminary Results of Antidumping*

Duty Administrative Review, 75 FR 26922, 26923 (May 13, 2010), unchanged in *Magnesium Metal from the Russian Federation: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 75 FR 56989 (September 17, 2010).

¹³ In a recently completed changed circumstances review, we found that NSC, Nippon Steel Nisshin Co., Ltd. (Nippon Nisshin), and Nippon Steel Trading Corporation (NSTC) are affiliated companies that should be treated as a single entity and as the successor-in-interest to Nippon Steel & Sumitomo Metal Corporation (NSSMC), Nisshin Steel Co., Ltd. (Nisshin Steel), and Nippon Steel & Sumikin Bussan Corporation (NSSBC), respectively. See *Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 84 FR 46713 (September 5, 2019). In the absence of record

information indicating that Commerce should reevaluate this determination, we are treating these companies as a single entity for purposes of this administrative review.

¹⁴ We collapsed JFE Shoji Trade Corporation with JFE Steel Corporation in the underlying investigation. See *Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination*, 81 FR 15222 (March 22, 2016), and accompanying PDM at 8–9, unchanged in *Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 81 FR 53409 (August 12, 2016).

Producers/exporters	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
Metal One Corporation	0.00
Mitsui & Co., Ltd	0.00
Miyama Industry Co., Ltd	0.00
Nakagawa Special Steel Inc	0.00
Nippon Steel & Sumikin Logistics Co., Ltd	0.00
Okaya & Co. Ltd	0.00
Panasonic Corporation	0.00
Saint-Gobain K.K	0.00
Shinsho Corporation	0.00
Sumitomo Corporation	0.00
Suzukaku Corporation	0.00
Toyota Tsusho Corporation Nagoya	0.00

Disclosure

We intend to disclose the calculations performed in connection with these final results within five days of the date of publication of this notice to parties in this proceeding, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.224(b).

Assessment

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b), Commerce shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries of subject merchandise in accordance with the final results of this review. Commerce intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of the final results of this review in the **Federal Register**.

Where the respondent reported reliable entered values, we calculated importer- (or customer-) specific *ad valorem* rates by aggregating the dumping margins calculated for all U.S. sales to each importer (or customer) and dividing this amount by the total entered value of the sales to each importer (or customer).¹⁵ Where Commerce calculated a weighted-average dumping margin by dividing the total amount of dumping for reviewed sales to that party by the total sales quantity associated with those transactions, Commerce will direct CBP to assess importer- (or customer-) specific assessment rates based on the resulting per-unit rates.¹⁶ Where an importer- (or customer-) specific *ad valorem* or per-unit rate is greater than *de minimis* (i.e., 0.50 percent), Commerce will instruct CBP to collect the appropriate duties at the time of liquidation.¹⁷ Where an importer- (or customer-) specific *ad valorem* or per-unit rate is zero or *de minimis*, Commerce will instruct CBP to liquidate

appropriate entries without regard to antidumping duties.¹⁸

For the companies which were not selected for individual review, we will assign an assessment rate based on the methodology described in the “Rates for Non-Examined Companies” section.

Consistent with Commerce’s assessment practice, for entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by NSC, Tokyo Steel, or the non-examined companies for which the producer did not know that its merchandise was destined for the United States, 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.¹⁹

Cash Deposit Requirements

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rates for the companies listed in these final results will be equal to the weighted-average dumping margins established in the final results of this review; (2) for merchandise exported by producers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recently completed segment in which the company was reviewed; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the producer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recently

completed segment of this proceeding for the producer of the subject merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other producers or exporters will continue to be 5.58 percent,²⁰ the all-others rate established in the LTFV investigation. 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 presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Order

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.

Notification to Interested Parties

We are issuing and publishing these results in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213(h) and 351.221(b)(5) of Commerce’s regulations.

¹⁸ See 19 CFR 351.106(c)(2).

¹⁹ For a full discussion of this practice, see *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003).

²⁰ See *Certain Hot-Rolled Steel Flat Products from Japan: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Final Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances*, 81 FR 53409 (August 12, 2016).

¹⁵ See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

¹⁶ *Id.*

¹⁷ *Id.*

Dated: September 9, 2020.

Joseph A. Laroski, Jr.,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy and Negotiations.

Appendix I

List of Topics Discussed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Order
- IV. Application of Partial Facts Available and Use of Adverse Inference
- V. Final Determination of No Shipments
- VI. Changes Since the Preliminary Results
- VII. Discussion of the Issues

Tokyo Steel-Specific Issues

Comment 1: Whether Tokyo Steel's Scrap Reporting is Flawed

Comment 2: Whether Commerce Should Adjust Tokyo Steel's Reported Costs by Assigning Non-Prime Cost of Production to Prime Products

Comment 3: Whether the Quality Product Characteristic for Some of Tokyo Steel's HM Sales is Incorrect

NSC-Specific Issues

Comment 4: Whether Commerce Should Continue to Apply Partial AFA to Certain NSC's Affiliated Downstream Resales in the Home Market

Comment 5: Whether Commerce Properly Excluded Certain Further Manufactured U.S. Sales

Comment 6: Whether NSC's Reported Domestic Inland Freight and Warehousing for U.S. Sales Were Made at Arm's Length

Comment 7: Whether Commerce Should Account for NSC's Unreported Domestic Brokerage Expenses

Comment 8: Whether NSC's Reported International Freight Expenses Were Made at Arm's Length

Comment 9: Whether NSC Has Accounted for the Miscellaneous U.S. Inland Freight Expenses

Comment 10: Whether Commerce Should Apply AFA for Determining NSC's Further Manufacturing Costs

Comment 11: Whether Commerce Incorrectly Increased NSC's Further Manufacturing Costs to Account for the Markup Steelscape Washington LLC Charges Steel Scape LLC

VIII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2020-20426 Filed 9-15-20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-821-802]

Draft Amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium From the Russian Federation; Request for Comment

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

SUMMARY: The U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) and State Atomic Energy Corporation Rosatom (Rosatom) have initiated a draft amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation (Agreement). The draft amendment will allow the Russian Federation to export Russian uranium products to the United States in accordance with the export limits and other terms detailed in the amendment. Commerce is inviting interested parties, industrial users, and the public to comment on the text of the draft amendment to the Agreement.

DATES: Applicable September 11, 2020. Comments are due by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time on September 28, 2020.

ADDRESSES: All submissions to Commerce must be filed electronically using Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at <https://access.trade.gov>. See the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for additional details.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally C. Gannon or Jill Buckles, Bilateral Agreements Unit, 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 October 16, 1992, Commerce signed an agreement with the Russian Federation's Ministry for Atomic Energy (MINATOM), the predecessor to Rosatom, under section 734(l) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), suspending the antidumping duty investigation on uranium from the Russian Federation.¹ There have been five amendments to the Agreement, the most recent of which was signed on February 1, 2008.² On February 22,

¹ See Antidumping; Uranium from Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Russia, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan; Suspension of Investigations and Amendment of Preliminary Determinations, 57 FR 49220, 49235 (October 30, 1992).

² See Amendment to Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation, 59 FR 15373 (April 1, 1994); Amendments to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation, 61 FR 56665 (November 4, 1996); Amendment to Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation, 62 FR 37879 (July 15, 1997); and Amendment to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the

2019, Commerce formally opened consultations with Rosatom with respect to a possible extension of the Agreement's term.³

Draft Amendment

On September 11, 2020, Commerce and Rosatom initiated a draft amendment to the Agreement. The draft amendment allows for exports of Russian uranium products to the United States in accordance with the export limits and other terms detailed in the amendment. In general, the draft amendment will reduce U.S. reliance on imports of uranium from Russia over the long term. Under the current Agreement, Russian uranium exports are limited to approximately 20 percent of U.S. enrichment demand. Under the draft amended Agreement, the export limits will be equivalent to 24 percent of U.S. enrichment demand in 2021, 20 percent in 2022, 24 percent in 2023, 20 percent per year from 2024 to 2027, and 15 percent per year from 2028 to 2040. (Export limits are to be calculated on the basis of the World Nuclear Association's Lower Scenario, a 4.4 percent product assay, and a 0.3 percent tails assay.) These figures correspond to an average of approximately 17 percent over the next 20 years.

The draft amendment to the Agreement also strengthens existing protections for the U.S. commercial enrichment industry, by extending and reducing the Agreement's export limits, as discussed above.

The draft amendment to the Agreement establishes protections for U.S. uranium miners and the U.S. uranium converter by limiting sales of enriched uranium product (EUP) and sales of enrichment (*i.e.*, separative work units, or SWU) plus conversion under the export limits. Under the draft amendment, the cap on exports pursuant to EUP sales is equivalent to 15 percent of U.S. enrichment demand in 2021, 9.8 percent in 2022, 10.2 percent in 2023, 5.7 percent in 2024, 5.3 percent in 2025, and 5 percent per year from 2026 to 2040. The cap for additional exports pursuant to sales of SWU plus conversion is equivalent to 1 percent of U.S. enrichment demand in 2021, approximately 3 percent from 2022 to 2025, and zero percent from 2026 to 2040. These figures correspond to an average of 7 percent of U.S. enrichment demand for the combined

Russian Federation, 73 FR 7705 (February 11, 2008).

³ See Letter to Rosatom from P. Lee Smith, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy & Negotiations, "Consultations on the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Investigation on Uranium from the Russian Federation," dated February 22, 2019.