of controlling trade for national security and foreign policy reasons.

### Agenda

1. Opening remarks by the Vice Chair
2. Export Control Reform Update
3. Presentation of papers or comments by the Public
4. Office of Foreign Assets Control Presentation
5. Self-Jurisdiction and Self-Classification Data and Discussion
6. SNAP-R Manual Updates Discussion
7. Subcommittee Updates

### Background

On July 14, 1987, the Department issued an antidumping duty order on solid urea from the Soviet Union. Following the break-up of the Soviet Union, the antidumping duty order was transferred to the individual members of the Commonwealth of Independent States. Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), we received a timely request for a new shipper review of the order from Joint Stock Company PhosAgro-Cherepovets (PhosAgro). PhosAgro certified that it is both the producer and exporter of the subject merchandise upon which the request was based.

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(I) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(i), PhosAgro certified that it did not export subject merchandise to the United States during the period of investigation (POI). In addition, pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B)(i)(II) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2)(iii)(A), PhosAgro certified that, since the initiation of the investigation, it has never been affiliated with any exporter or producer who exported subject merchandise to the United States during the POI, including those respondents not individually examined during the POI.

In addition to the certifications described above, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.214(b)(2), PhosAgro submitted documentation establishing the following: (1) The date on which it first shipped subject merchandise for export to the United States; (2) the volume of its first shipment; and (3) the date of its first sale to an unaffiliated customer in the United States.

### Period of Review

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.214(g)(1)(i)(A), the period of review

### Initiative of New Shipper Review

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(b)(1), the Department finds that the request from PhosAgro meets the threshold requirements for initiation of a new shipper review for a shipment of solid urea from Russia produced and exported by PhosAgro. The Department intends to issue the preliminary results of this new shipper review no later than 180 days from the date of initiation and final results of the review no later than 90 days after the date the preliminary results are issued.

We will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to allow, at the option of the importer, the posting, until the completion of the review, of a bond or security in lieu of a cash deposit for each entry of the subject merchandise from PhosAgro, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(e). Because PhosAgro certified that it produced and exported subject merchandise, the sale of which is the basis for the request for a new shipper review, we will apply the bonding privilege to PhosAgro only for subject merchandise which was produced and exported by PhosAgro.

To assist in its analysis of the bona fides of PhosAgro’s sales, upon initiation of this new shipper review, the Department will require PhosAgro to submit on an ongoing basis complete transaction information concerning any sales of subject merchandise to the United States that were made subsequent to thePOR.

Interested parties requiring access to proprietary information in the new shipper review should submit applications for disclosure under administrative protective order in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 and 351.306.

This initiation and notice are published in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214 and 351.221(c)(1)(i).

---

1. See Antidumping Duty Order: Urea from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, 52 FR 26367 (July 14, 1987).
2. See Solid Urea from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; Transfer of the AD Order on Solid Urea from the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the Commonwealth of Independent States and the Baltic States; and Opportunity to Comment, 57 FR 28828 (June 29, 1992).
4. See PhosAgro’s new shipper request at Exhibit 1.
5. Id.
6. Id.
7. See PhosAgro’s new shipper request at Exhibit 1 and Exhibit 2.
Gary Taverman, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

Multilayered Wood Flooring From the People’s Republic of China: Correction to the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.
FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Lilit Astvatsatryan or William Horn, AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–6412 or (202) 482–2615, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: On July 15, 2015, the Department of Commerce (“Department”) published the final results of the 2012–2013 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on multilayered wood flooring from the People’s Republic of China.1 The period of review (“POR”) is December 1, 2012, through November 30, 2013. The Department is issuing this notice to correct an inadvertent error in the Final Results. Specifically, the Department initiated a review of Baishan Huafeng Wooden Product Co. Ltd. (“Baishan Huafeng Wood”),2 and the company listed in the Final Results is also Baishan Huafeng Wood. However, the record reflects that the correct company name, and the company to which the Department assigned a separate rate, is Baishan Huafeng Wooden Product Co. Ltd. (“Baishan Huafeng Wooden”).3 Accordingly, we intended to include Baishan Huafeng Wooden, not Baishan Huafeng Wood, in the list of companies that received a separate rate during the POR as identified in our Final Results. This correction to the final results of administrative review is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(b) and 777(i) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended. Dated: August 21, 2015.

Gary Taverman, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration

Purified Carboxymethylcellulose From the Netherlands: Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review and Intent to Revoke the Antidumping Duty Order

AGENCY: Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.
SUMMARY: In response to a request by Ashland Specialty Ingredients, G.P. (Ashland), the Department of Commerce (the Department) is initiating a changed circumstances review (CCR) of the antidumping duty (AD) order on purified carboxymethylcellulose (CMC) from the Netherlands. Based on the information received, we preliminarily intend to revoke the Netherlands Order.1 Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: John Drury, or Angelica Townsend, AD/CVD Operations, Office VI, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0195 or (202) 482–3019, respectively.

DATES: Effective Date: August 31, 2015.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On July 11, 2005, the Department published in the Federal Register the AD order on CMC from the Netherlands.2 On July 8, 2015, in accordance with sections 751(b) and 751(d)(1) of the Act, 19 CFR 351.216(b), and 19 CFR 351.222(g)(1), Ashland, the petitioner and sole domestic producer of CMC, requested revocation of the Netherlands Order. Ashland requested that the Department conduct the CCR on an expedited basis pursuant to 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(i) and that the effective date of the revocation be July 1, 2014.

Scope of the Order

The merchandise covered by this order is all purified CMC, sometimes also referred to as purified sodium CMC, polyanionic cellulose, or cellulose gum, which is a white to off-white, non-toxic, odorless, biodegradable powder, comprising sodium CMC that has been refined and purified to a minimum assay of 90 percent. Purified CMC does not include unpurified or crude CMC, CMC fluidized Polymer Suspensions, and CMC that is cross-linked through heat treatment. Purified CMC is CMC that has undergone one or more purification operations which, at a minimum, reduce the remaining salt and other by-product portion of the product to less than ten percent.

The merchandise subject to this order is classified in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States at subheading 3912.31.00. This tariff classification is provided for convenience and customs purposes; however, the written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

Initiation and Preliminary Results of Changed Circumstances Review

Section 782(h)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.222(g)(1)(i) provide that the Department may revoke an order (in whole or in part) if it determines that producers accounting for substantially all of the production of the domestic like product have no further interest in the order, in whole or in part. In addition, in the event the Department determines that expedited action is warranted, 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii) permits the Department to combine the notices of initiation and preliminary results.

On July 8, 2015, Ashland requested that the Department conduct the CCR on an expedited basis. Ashland stated that, as the sole U.S. producer of CMC, it accounts for all of the production of the domestic like product. Ashland also stated that it has no interest in the continuation of the Netherlands Order.3 Therefore, at the request of Ashland and in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 751(d)(1) of the Act, 19 CFR 351.216, 19 CFR 351.222(g)(1), and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(ii), we are initiating this CCR on CMC from the Netherlands to determine whether revocation of the order is warranted with respect to this product. In addition, we determine that expedited action is warranted. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3)(iii) and that the effective date of the revocation be July 1, 2014.

2 See Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Mexico, the Netherlands and Sweden, 70 FR 39734 (July 11, 2005) (Netherlands Order).
3 Id.