lead crystal glasses; non-lead crystal glasses; and, drinking glasses (duty rate ranges from duty-free to 28.5%).

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the Board’s Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is October 26, 2015.

A copy of the notification will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the “Reading Room” section of the Board’s Web site, which is accessible via www.trade.gov/ftz.

For further information, contact Elizabeth Whiteman at Elizab eh.Whiteman@trade.gov or (202) 482–0473.

Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2015–23078 Filed 9–11–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Foreign-Trade Zones Board
[B–60–2015]

Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) 84—Houston, Texas; Notification of Proposed Production Activity; Mitsubishi Caterpillar Forklift America Inc. (Forklift Trucks); Houston, Texas

Mitsubishi Caterpillar Forklift America Inc. (MCFA), an operator of FTZ 84, submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the FTZ Board for its facility in Houston, Texas. The notification conforming to the requirements of the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR 400.22) was received on August 13, 2015.

MCFA already has authority to produce forklift trucks (Class I through Class V) powered by gasoline, propane or electric motors within Site 27 of FTZ 84. The current request would add certain foreign-status components to the scope of authority. Pursuant to 15 CFR 400.14(b), additional FTZ authority would be limited to the specific foreign-status materials and components and specific finished products described in the submitted notification (as described below) and subsequently authorized by the FTZ Board.

Production under FTZ procedures could exempt MCFA from customs duty payments on the foreign status components used in export production. On its domestic sales, MCFA would be able to choose the duty rates during customs entry procedures that apply to forklift trucks (free) for the foreign status materials and components noted below and in the existing scope of authority. Customs duties also could possibly be deferred or reduced on foreign status production equipment.

The components sourced from abroad include: Acrylonitrile-butadiene rubber sheets; alloy/non-alloy steel angles/ shapes/sections/pipes/tubes; steel liquid/compressed petroleum gas tanks and cylinders; steel wires; and, liquid crystal display video monitors (duty rate ranges from free to 5.0%).

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the FTZ Board’s Executive Secretary at the address below. The closing period for their receipt is October 26, 2015.

A copy of the notification will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Executive Secretary, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, Room 21013, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230–0002, and in the “Reading Room” section of the FTZ Board’s Web site, which is accessible via www.trade.gov/ftz.

For further information, contact Pierre Duy at Pierre.Duy@trade.gov or (202) 482–1378.

Dated: September 2, 2015.
Andrew McGilvray,
Executive Secretary.
[FR Doc. 2015–23082 Filed 9–11–15; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Bureau of Industry and Security
[Docket No. 150902803–5803–01]

Effects of Extending Foreign Policy-Based Export Controls

AGENCY: Bureau of Industry and Security, Commerce.

ACTION: Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) is seeking public comments on the effect of existing foreign policy-based export controls in the Export Administration Regulations. Section 6 of the Export Administration Act requires BIS to consult with industry on the effect of such controls and to report the results of the consultations to Congress. BIS is conducting the consultations through this request for public comments. Comments from all interested persons are welcome. All comments will be made available for public inspection and copying and included in a report to be submitted to Congress.

DATES: Comments must be received by October 14, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be submitted through the Federal e-Rulemaking portal (www.regulations.gov). The regulations.gov ID for this notice is: BIS–2015–0029. Comments may also be sent by email to publiccomments@bis.doc.gov or on paper to Regulatory Policy Division, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Room 2099B, Washington, DC 20230. Include the phrase “FPBEC Comment” in the subject line of the email message or on the envelope if submitting comments on paper. All comments must be in writing (either submitted to regulations.gov, by email or on paper). All comments, including Personal Identifying Information (e.g., name, address) voluntarily submitted by the commenter will be a matter of public record and will be available for public inspection and copying. Do not submit Confidential Business Information or otherwise sensitive or protected information.


Copies of the current Annual Foreign Policy Report to the Congress are available at http://www.bis.doc.gov/index.php/about-bis/newsroom/archives/27-about-bis/502-foreign-policy-reports, and copies may also be requested by calling the Office of Nonproliferation and Treaty Compliance at the number listed above.

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION: Foreign policy-based controls in the Export Administration Regulations (EAR) are implemented pursuant to section 6 of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, (50 U.S.C. app. sections 2401–2420 (2000)) (EAA). The current foreign policy-based export controls maintained by the Bureau of Industry and Security (BIS) are set forth in the EAR (15 CFR parts 730–774), including in parts 742 (CCL Based Controls), 744 (End-User and End-Use Based Controls) and 746 (Embargoes and Other Special Controls). These controls apply to a range of countries, items, activities and persons, including:

- Entities acting contrary to the national security or foreign policy interests of the United States (§ 744.11);
• Certain general purpose microprocessors for “military end-uses” and “military end-users” (§ 744.17);
• Significant items (SI): Hot section technology for the development, production, or overhaul of commercial aircraft engines, components, and systems (§ 742.14);
• Encryption items (§ 742.15);
• Crime control and detection items (§ 742.7);
• Specially designed implements of torture (§ 742.11);
• Certain firearms and related items based on the Organization of American States Model Regulations for the Control of the International Movement of Firearms, their Parts and Components and Ammunition included within the Inter-American Convention Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives, and Other Related Materials (§ 742.17);
• Regional stability items (§ 742.6);
• Equipment and related technical data used in the design, development, production, or use of certain rocket systems and unmanned air vehicles (§§ 742.5 and 744.3);
• Chemical precursors and biological agents, associated equipment, technical data, and software related to the production of chemical and biological agents (§§ 742.2 and 744.4) and various chemicals included on the list of those chemicals controlled pursuant to the Chemical Weapons Convention (§ 742.18);
• Communication intercepting devices, software and technology (§ 742.13);
• Nuclear propulsion (§ 744.5);
• Aircraft and vessels (§ 744.7);
• Restrictions on exports and reexports to certain persons designated as proliferators of weapons of mass destruction (§ 744.8);
• Certain cameras to be used by military end-users or incorporated into a military commodity (§ 744.9);
• Countries designated as Supporters of Acts of International Terrorism (§§ 742.8, 742.9, 742.10, 742.19, 746.4, 746.7, and 746.9);
• Certain entities in Russia (§ 744.10);
• Individual terrorists and terrorist organizations (§§ 744.12, 744.13 and 744.14);
• Certain persons designated by Executive Order 13315 (“Blocking Property of the Former Iraqi Regime, Its Senior Officials and Their Family Members”) (§ 744.18);
• Certain sanctioned entities (§ 744.20);
• Embargoed countries (Part 746); and

In addition, the EAR impose foreign policy-based export controls on certain nuclear related commodities, technology, end-uses and end-users (§§ 742.3 and 744.2), in part, implementing section 309(c) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act (42 U.S.C. 2139a).

Under the provisions of section 6 of the EAA, export controls maintained for foreign policy purposes require annual extension. Section 6 of the EAA requires a report to Congress when foreign policy-based export controls are extended. The EAA expired on August 20, 2001. Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR. 2001 Comp., p. 783 (2002)), as amended by Executive Order 13637 of March 8, 2013, 78 FR 16129 (March 13, 2013), which has been extended by successive Presidential Notices, the most recent being that of August 7, 2015 (80 FR 48233 (Aug. 11, 2015)), continues the EAR and, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the EAA, in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701–1706 (2000)). The Department of Commerce, as appropriate, follows the provisions of section 6 of the EAA by reviewing its foreign policy-based export controls, conducting consultations with industry on such controls through public comments and preparing a report to be submitted to Congress. In January 2015, the Secretary of Commerce, on the recommendation of the Secretary of State, extended for one year all foreign policy-based export controls then in effect. BIS is now soliciting public comment on the effects of extending the existing foreign policy-based export controls from January 21, 2016 to January 20, 2017. Among the criteria considered in determining whether to extend U.S. foreign policy-based export controls are the following:

1. The likelihood that such controls will achieve their intended foreign policy purposes, in light of other factors, including the availability from other countries of the goods, software or technology proposed for such controls;
2. Whether the foreign policy objective of such controls can be achieved through negotiations or other alternative means;
3. The compatibility of the controls with the foreign policy objectives of the United States and with overall U.S. policy toward the country subject to the controls;
4. Whether the reaction of other countries to the extension of such controls is likely to render the controls ineffective in achieving the intended foreign policy objective or be counterproductive to U.S. foreign policy interests;
5. The comparative benefits to U.S. foreign policy objectives versus the effect of the controls on the export performance of the United States, the competitive position of the United States in the international economy, the international reputation of the United States as a supplier of goods and technology; and
6. The ability of the United States to effectively enforce the controls.

BIS is particularly interested in receiving comments on the economic impact of proliferation controls. BIS is also interested in industry information relating to the following:

1. Information on the effect of foreign policy-based export controls on sales of U.S. products to third countries (i.e., those countries not targeted by sanctions), including the views of foreign purchasers or prospective customers regarding U.S. foreign policy-based export controls.
2. Information on controls maintained by U.S. trade partners. For example, to what extent do U.S. trade partners have similar controls on goods and technology on a worldwide basis or to specific destinations?
3. Information on licensing policies or practices by our foreign trade partners that are similar to U.S. foreign policy based export controls, including license review criteria, use of conditions, and requirements for pre- and post-shipment verifications (preferably supported by examples of approvals, denials and foreign regulations).
4. Suggestions for bringing foreign policy-based export controls more into line with multilateral practice.
5. Comments or suggestions to make multilateral controls more effective.
6. Information that illustrates the effect of foreign policy-based export controls on trade or acquisitions by intended targets of the controls.
7. Data or other information on the effect of foreign policy-based export controls on overall trade at the level of individual industrial sectors.
8. Suggestions for measuring the effect of foreign policy-based export controls on trade.
9. Information on the use of foreign policy-based export controls on targeted countries, entities, or individuals. BIS is also interested in comments relating generally to the extension or revision of existing foreign policy-based export controls.

Parties submitting comments are asked to be as specific as possible. All comments received before the close of the comment period will be considered by BIS in reviewing the controls and in
developing the report to Congress. All comments received in response to this notice will be displayed on BIS’s Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Web site at http://foia.bis.doc.gov/ and on the Federal e-Rulemaking portal at www.Regulations.gov. All comments will also be included in a report to Congress, as required by section 6 of the EAA, which directs that BIS report to Congress the results of its consultations with industry on the effects of foreign policy-based controls.

Dated: September 8, 2015.
Kevin J. Wolf, Assistant Secretary for Export Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration


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

SUMMARY: On March 9, 2015, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on low-enriched uranium (LEU) from France.1 The review covers one producer or exporter of the subject merchandise, Eurodif S.A., AREVA NC, and AREVA NC, Inc. (collectively AREVA). The Department determines that AREVA made no shipments of subject merchandise during the POR. The Department also determines that we will issue revised certifications required from the importer and end-user.

DATES: Effective Date: September 14, 2015.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
For a complete description of the events that followed the Preliminary


Results, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.2 The Issues and Decision Memorandum is a public document and is available electronically at Enforcement and Compliance’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Services System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at http://access.trade.gov, and is available to all parties in the Central Records Unit of the main Commerce Building, room B8024. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum is also accessible on the internet at http://enforcement.trade.gov/fm/index.html. The signed Issues and Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Issues and Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Period of Review
The period of review (POR) is February 1, 2013, through January 31, 2014.

Scope of the Order
The product covered by the order is all low-enriched uranium. Low-enriched uranium is enriched uranium hexafluoride (UF6) with a U235 product assay of less than 20 percent that has not been converted into another chemical form, such as UO2, or fabricated into nuclear fuel assemblies, regardless of the means by which the LEU is produced (including low-enriched uranium produced through the down-blending of highly enriched uranium).3

Analysis of Comments Received
All issues raised by the parties in the case and rebuttal briefs are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum is appended to this notice.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results
In the Preliminary Results the Department determined that AREVA had no shipments subject to the antidumping duty order. We have also determined to allow revised the re-export certifications required under the scope of the order to allow replenishment of LEU that has been re-exported and to address the issue of samples in future entries.4

Determination of No Shipments
We determine that AREVA had no shipments of merchandise subject to the antidumping duty order on LEU from France during the POR.

Determination of Revised Certifications
The Department will issue customs instructions with revised certifications to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP). These instructions will be posted on CBP’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Online Search System, available at http://adcdv.cbp.dhs.gov/adcdvweb/, and the Department will release the customs instructions with revised certifications via ACCESS. The revised certifications are effective when posted on the CBP’s Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Online Search System.

Assessment Rates
Since the Department found that AREVA had no shipments subject to the order during the POR, we did not calculate importer-specific assessment rates for these final results.5

The Department clarified its “automatic assessment” regulation on May 6, 2003. This clarification will apply to entries of subject merchandise during the POR produced by companies included in the final results of review for which these companies did not know that the merchandise was destined for the United States. In such instances, we will instruct CBP to liquidate un-reviewed entries at the all-others rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction.6

We intend to issue instructions to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of this review.

Cash Deposit Requirements
The following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of LEU from France entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for AREVA will remain unchanged from the

2 See “Decision Memorandum for the Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Low-Enriched Uranium From France: 2013–2014” from Gary Taverman, Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations to Paul Piquado, Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance (Issues and Decision Memorandum), dated concurrently with these results and hereby adopted by this notice.

3 For a full description of the scope of the order, see the Issues and Decision Memorandum.

4 See Issue 2: Re-export Certifications section of the Issues and Decision Memorandum.