

platform user instructions, and demonstration plans and scripts necessary to demonstrate the desired capabilities. Each prospective participant will train NIST personnel as necessary, to operate its product in capability demonstrations to the financial services community. Following successful demonstrations, NIST will publish a description of the security platform and its performance characteristics sufficient to permit other organizations to develop and deploy security platforms that meet the security objectives of the Access Rights Management for the Financial Services sector use case. These descriptions will be public information. Under the terms of the consortium agreement, NIST will support development of interfaces among participants' products by providing IT infrastructure, laboratory facilities, office facilities, collaboration facilities, and staff support to component composition, security platform documentation, and demonstration activities.

The dates of the demonstration of the Access Rights Management for the Financial Services sector capability will be announced on the NCCoE Web site at least two weeks in advance at <http://nccoe.nist.gov/>. The expected outcome of the demonstration is to improve access rights management across an entire financial services sector enterprise. Participating organizations will gain from the knowledge that their products are interoperable with other participants' offerings.

For additional information on the NCCoE governance, business processes, and NCCoE operational structure, visit the NCCoE Web site <http://nccoe.nist.gov/>.

**Richard Cavanagh,**

*Acting Associate Director for Laboratory Programs.*

[FR Doc. 2015-07590 Filed 4-2-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-13-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### Economics and Statistics Administration

#### Commerce Data Advisory Council Meeting

**AGENCY:** Economic and Statistics Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of public meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Economic and Statistics Administration (ESA) is giving notice of a meeting of Commerce Data Advisory Council (CDAC). The CDAC will

address areas such as data management practices; common, open data standards; policy issues related to privacy, latency, and consistency; effective models for public-private partnership; external uses of Commerce data; and, methods to build new feedback loops between the Department and data users. The CDAC will meet in a plenary session on April 23-24, 2015. Last-minute changes to the schedule are possible, which could prevent giving advance public notice of schedule adjustments.

**DATES:** April 23-24, 2015. On April 23, the meeting will begin at approximately 12:00 p.m. and end at approximately 5:00 p.m. On April 24, the meeting will begin at approximately 9:00 a.m. and end at approximately 1:00 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** The meeting will be held at Google Washington, DC, 25 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Suite 900, Washington, DC 20001.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Burton Reist, [BReist@doc.gov](mailto:BReist@doc.gov) Director of External Communication and DFO, CDAC, Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482-3331.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The CDAC comprises as many as 20 members. The Committee provides an organized and continuing channel of communication between recognized experts in the data industry (collection, compilation, analysis, dissemination and privacy protection) and the Department of Commerce. The CDAC provides advice and recommendations, to include process and infrastructure improvements, to the Secretary, DOC and the DOC data-bureau leadership on ways to make Commerce data easier to find, access, use, combine and disseminate. The aim of this advice shall be to maximize the value of Commerce data to all users including governments, businesses, communities, academia, and individuals.

The Committee meeting is in accordance with the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Title 5, United States Code, Appendix 2, Section 10(a)(b)).

All meetings are open to the public. A brief period will be set aside at the meeting for public comment on April 24, 2015. However, individuals with extensive questions or statements must submit them in writing to: [DataAdvisoryCouncil@doc.gov](mailto:DataAdvisoryCouncil@doc.gov) (subject line "APRIL 2015 CDAC Meeting Public Comment"), or by letter submission to the Director of External Communication and DFO, CDAC, Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics

Administration, 1401 Constitution Ave. NW., Washington, DC 20230. Such submissions will be included in the record for the meeting if received by Friday, April 17, 2015.

The meeting is physically accessible to persons with disabilities. Requests for sign language interpretation or other auxiliary aids should be directed to the Director of External Communication as soon as possible, preferably two weeks prior to the meeting. If you plan to attend the meeting, please register by Monday, April 20, 2015. You may access the online registration from the following link: [https://www.regonline.com/cdac\\_april\\_2015\\_meeting](https://www.regonline.com/cdac_april_2015_meeting).

Seating is available to the public on a first-come, first-served basis.

Dated: March 30, 2015.

**Austin Durrer,**

*Chief of Staff for Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Economics and Statistics Administration.*

[FR Doc. 2015-07773 Filed 4-2-15; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-932]

#### Steel Threaded Rod From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Results of Scope Ruling on Antidumping Duty Order and Notice of Amended Final Results of Scope Ruling on Antidumping Duty Order

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

**SUMMARY:** On September 22, 2014, the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) issued a decision that engineered steel coil rod (coil rod) imported by A.L. Patterson, Inc. (Patterson) was outside the scope of the antidumping duty order on certain steel threaded rod from the People's Republic of China on threaded rod from the PRC.<sup>1</sup> On December 29, 2014, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT or Court) issued an order for the Department to take action on remand in accordance with the CAFC's decision and to find that Patterson's engineered steel coil rod is outside the

<sup>1</sup> See *A.L. Patterson, Inc., v. United States*, 585 Fed. Appx. 778, 785-86 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (*Patterson CAFC 2014*); see also *Certain Steel Threaded Rod from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Antidumping Duty Order*, 74 FR 17154 (April 4, 2009) (*AD Order*).

scope of the *AD Order*.<sup>2</sup> On March 3, 2015, the CIT issued final judgment in *A.L. Patterson, Inc. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 11–00192, affirming the Department of Commerce’s (the Department) final results of redetermination pursuant to remand.<sup>3</sup>

Consistent with section 516A of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the Department’s final results of the scope ruling on the antidumping duty order on certain steel threaded rod from the People’s Republic of China, and is amending the final results with respect to coil rod imported by Patterson.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* October 2, 2014.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Anne Gillman, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6433.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

In our initial scope ruling, the Department found coil rod imported by Patterson within the scope of the *AD Order* on threaded rod from the PRC.<sup>4</sup> In that scope ruling, the Department stated that the description of the product contained in the petition, the initial investigation, and the determinations by the Department (including prior scope determinations) and the International Trade Commission (ITC) were, in fact, dispositive with respect to Patterson’s engineered steel coil rod.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, the Department conducted the scope determination pursuant to 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1). Based on that analysis, as the scope language of the *AD Order* was clear in its requirement that subject merchandise consist of products with solid, circular cross sections, with threading along greater than 25 percent threading of their total length, and Patterson’s coil rod met these specific requirements of the scope of *AD Order*, the Department found that Patterson’s coil rod was within the scope of the *AD Order*.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>2</sup> See *A.L. Patterson, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 11–00192 (CIT December 29, 2014) (*CIT Second Remand Order*).

<sup>3</sup> See Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Remand, *A.L. Patterson v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 11–00192 (Jan. 26, 2015), available at: <http://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/> (Final Second Remand Redetermination).

<sup>4</sup> See *Certain Steel Threaded Rod from the People’s Republic of China: A.L. Patterson Final Scope Ruling*, A–570–932 (May 24, 2011) (Final Scope Ruling); see also *AD Order*.

<sup>5</sup> See Final Scope Ruling at 5.

<sup>6</sup> *Id.*, at 5–6.

Patterson challenged the Department’s Final Scope Ruling in the CIT. On August 6, 2012, the CIT remanded the Final Scope Ruling to the Department to reconsider its decision that the engineered steel coil rod imported by Patterson falls within the scope of the *AD Order*.<sup>7</sup> Specifically, the Court held that: (1) The Department’s decision that the scope language encompasses Patterson’s product is not supported by substantial evidence; (2) if there is no finding of injury or sales at less-than-fair-value (LTFV) for Patterson’s product, the Department’s determination is not in accordance with law; and (3) the Department failed to adequately explain the reasons for its determination.<sup>8</sup> The CIT instructed the Department on remand “to reconsider whether the language of the order includes Patterson’s coil rod, following the interpretive procedure established in 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1).”<sup>9</sup>

On remand, the Department re-examined the language of the petition, prior scope determinations, and original investigations of the Department and ITC, and the Department continued to find that Patterson’s coil rod is within the scope of the *AD Order*.<sup>10</sup> After reviewing the petition, the ITC reports, and the original investigations, the Department found that Patterson’s coil rod matched the physical description of the same class or kind of merchandise previously considered by the Department and the ITC based on carbon content, threading along the rod, and circular cross-section.<sup>11</sup> Accordingly, the Department found that Patterson’s coil rod was within the scope of the *AD Order* under an analysis conducted pursuant to 19 CFR 351.225(k)(1).<sup>12</sup>

On May 22, 2013, the CIT sustained the Department’s First Remand Redetermination.<sup>13</sup> Patterson appealed the CIT’s judgment to the CAFC.

On September 22, 2014, the CAFC reversed the CIT’s judgment sustaining the First Remand Redetermination. As detailed below, the CAFC concluded, among other things, that substantial evidence did not support the Department’s determination that the coil rod at issue was part of the ITC’s

<sup>7</sup> See *A.L. Patterson, Inc. v. United States*, 34 Int’l Trade Rep. (BNA) 1894 (CIT 2012) (*CIT First Remand Order*).

<sup>8</sup> See *CIT First Remand Order* at 9–17.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.*, at 18.

<sup>10</sup> See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Remand (December 4, 2012) at 14 (First Remand Redetermination).

<sup>11</sup> *Id.*, at 14 and 16–19.

<sup>12</sup> *Id.*, at 14.

<sup>13</sup> See *A.L. Patterson, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 11–00192 (CIT May 22, 2013).

domestic industry analysis during its investigation.<sup>14</sup> Specifically, the CAFC found that “the record before us shows that the investigations that supported the antidumping order was {sic} not on Patterson’s coil rod but rather other kinds of steel threaded rods.”<sup>15</sup> Therefore, the CAFC concluded that “there is insufficient evidence to conclude that Patterson’s coil rod, a distinctly different product than steel threaded rod, was part of the {ITC}’s material injury investigation,” and as such, found that Patterson’s engineered steel coil rod is not subject to the *AD Order*.<sup>16</sup> On December 29, 2014, the CIT issued an order for the Department to take action on remand in accordance with the CAFC’s decision in *Patterson CAFC 2014* and to find that Patterson’s engineered steel coil rod is outside the scope of the *AD Order*.<sup>17</sup> In the Final Second Remand Redetermination, and in following the express directive of the *CIT Second Remand Order*, which instructed the Department to act in accordance with the CAFC’s decision in *Patterson CAFC 2014*, the Department found that the *AD Order* did not cover Patterson’s coil rod.<sup>18</sup> The CIT affirmed the Department’s Final Second Remand Determination in its entirety on March 3, 2015, and entered judgment.<sup>19</sup>

**Statutory Notice**

The CAFC’s decision in *Patterson CAFC 2014* and the CIT’s March 3, 2015, judgment affirming the Final Second Remand Determination constitutes final court decisions that are not in harmony with the Final Scope Ruling. This notice is published in fulfillment of the statutory publication requirements.

**Amended Final Results**

Because there is now a final court decision, the Department is amending the Final Scope Ruling with respect to Patterson’s coil rod as redetermined in the Final Second Remand Redetermination and finds engineered steel coil rod imported by imported by A.L. Patterson, Inc. to be outside the scope of the *AD Order*.

**Cash Deposit Requirements**

Because we now find that the scope of the *AD Order* does not cover Patterson’s coil rod, no cash deposits for

<sup>14</sup> See *A.L. Patterson, Inc., v. United States*, 585 Fed. Appx. 778, 785–86 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (*Patterson CAFC 2014*).

<sup>15</sup> *Id.*; *Cf. Sango Int’l, L.P. v. United States*, 484 F. 3d 1371, 1380–1 (CAFC 2007).

<sup>16</sup> See *Patterson CAFC 2014* at 15.

<sup>17</sup> See *CIT Second Remand Order*.

<sup>18</sup> Final Second Remand Determination.

<sup>19</sup> See *A.L. Patterson, Inc. v. United States*, Court No. 11–00192 (CIT March 3, 2015).

estimated antidumping duties on future entries of Patterson's coil rod merchandise will be required.

#### Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 27, 2015.

**Paul Piquado,**

*Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 2015-07771 Filed 4-2-15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce ("the Department") has received requests to conduct administrative reviews of various antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings with February anniversary dates. In accordance with the Department's regulations, we are initiating those administrative reviews.

**DATES:** *Effective Dates:* April 3, 2015.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brenda E. Waters, Office of AD/CVD Operations, Customs Liaison Unit, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4735.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The Department has received timely requests, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), for administrative reviews of various antidumping and countervailing duty orders and findings with February anniversary dates. With respect to the antidumping duty orders of Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp from India and Thailand, the initiation of the antidumping duty administrative review for these cases will be published in a separate initiation notice.

All deadlines for the submission of various types of information, certifications, or comments or actions by the Department discussed below refer to the number of calendar days from the applicable starting time.

#### Notice of No Sales

If a producer or exporter named in this notice of initiation had no exports, sales, or entries during the period of review ("POR"), it must notify the Department within 30 days of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. All submissions must be filed electronically at <http://access.trade.gov> in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303.<sup>1</sup> Such submissions are subject to verification in accordance with section 782(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). Further, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f)(1)(i), a copy must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

#### Respondent Selection

In the event the Department limits the number of respondents for individual examination for administrative reviews, the Department intends to select respondents based on U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") data for U.S. imports during the POR. We intend to release the CBP data under Administrative Protective Order ("APO") to all parties having an APO within seven days of publication of this initiation notice and to make our decision regarding respondent selection within 21 days of publication of this **Federal Register** notice. The Department invites comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection within five days of placement of the CBP data on the record of the applicable review. Rebuttal comments will be due five days after submission of initial comments.

In the event the Department decides it is necessary to limit individual examination of respondents and conduct respondent selection under section 777A(c)(2) of the Act:

In general, the Department has found that determinations concerning whether particular companies should be "collapsed" (*i.e.*, treated as a single entity for purposes of calculating antidumping duty rates) require a substantial amount of detailed information and analysis, which often require follow-up questions and analysis. Accordingly, the Department will not conduct collapsing analyses at the respondent selection phase of this review and will not collapse companies at the respondent selection phase unless there has been a determination to collapse certain companies in a previous segment of this antidumping proceeding (*i.e.*, investigation,

<sup>1</sup> See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures*, 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011).

administrative review, new shipper review or changed circumstances review). For any company subject to this review, if the Department determined, or continued to treat, that company as collapsed with others, the Department will assume that such companies continue to operate in the same manner and will collapse them for respondent selection purposes. Otherwise, the Department will not collapse companies for purposes of respondent selection. Parties are requested to (a) identify which companies subject to review previously were collapsed, and (b) provide a citation to the proceeding in which they were collapsed. Further, if companies are requested to complete the Quantity and Value ("Q&V") Questionnaire for purposes of respondent selection, in general each company must report volume and value data separately for itself. Parties should not include data for any other party, even if they believe they should be treated as a single entity with that other party. If a company was collapsed with another company or companies in the most recently completed segment of this proceeding where the Department considered collapsing that entity, complete Q&V data for that collapsed entity must be submitted.

#### Deadline for Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), a party that has requested a review may withdraw that request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. The regulation provides that the Department may extend this time if it is reasonable to do so. In order to provide parties additional certainty with respect to when the Department will exercise its discretion to extend this 90-day deadline, interested parties are advised that the Department does not intend to extend the 90-day deadline unless the requestor demonstrates that an extraordinary circumstance has prevented it from submitting a timely withdrawal request. Determinations by the Department to extend the 90-day deadline will be made on a case-by-case basis.

#### Separate Rates

In proceedings involving non-market economy ("NME") countries, the Department begins with a rebuttable presumption that all companies within the country are subject to government control and, thus, should be assigned a single antidumping duty deposit rate. It is the Department's policy to assign all exporters of merchandise subject to an administrative review in an NME