making it clear which information is required and which is optional, and by essentially walking complainants through the process, step-by-step. As noted above, over 90 percent of all ABA complaints are submitted using the online form, though the Access Board continues to accept written complaints (without the use of any form) submitted by email, mail, or fax for complainants who prefer or need to use these filing methods.

**Respondents:** Individuals.

**Estimated Number of Responses:** 200 responses annually.

**Frequency of Responses:** Nearly all complainants only ever file one ABA complaint. Approximately 200 individuals file ABA complaints with the Access Board each year.

**Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents:** Each Online ABA Complaint Form takes approximately 30 minutes to complete, for a total of 100 hours annually (200 complaints × .5 hours). There is no financial burden on complainants.

**Comments Requested**

Comments are invited on (a) whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the estimated burden of the proposed collection of information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information from respondents; and (d) ways to minimize the burden of the collection of information on those who are to respond.

David M. Capozzi,
Executive Director.

[FR Doc. 2016–28743 Filed 11–28–16; 8:45 am]
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**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**International Trade Administration**

[A–469–814 and A–570–898]

**Chlorinated Isocyanurates From Spain and the People’s Republic of China: Continuation of the Antidumping Duty Orders**

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) and the International Trade Commission (the ITC) have determined that revocation of the antidumping duty (AD) orders on chlorinated isocyanurates (chlorinated isos) from Spain and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States. Therefore, the Department is publishing a notice of continuation for these AD orders.

**DATES:** Effective November 29, 2016.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Chien-Min Yang or Jacqueline Arrowsmith, 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) 482–5484 or (202) 482–5255, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Background**

The Department published the antidumping duty orders on chlorinated isos from Spain and the PRC on June 24, 2005. On September 1, 2015, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department initiated sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on chlorinated isos from Spain and the PRC. On September 11, 2015, the Department received a notice of intent to participate from Clearon Corporation (Clearon), Occidental Chemical Corporation (OxyChem), and Bio-Lab, Inc. (Bio-Lab), (collectively, the petitioners), within the deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(1)(i). Petitioners are manufacturers of a domestic like product in the United States and, accordingly, are domestic interested parties pursuant to section 771(9)(C) of the Act. On October 1, 2015, the Department received an adequate substantive response to the notice of initiation from the domestic interested parties within the 30-day deadline specified in 19 CFR 351.218(d)(3)(i). The Department did not receive any responses from the respondent interested parties, i.e., chlorinated isos producers and exporters from Spain or the PRC. On the basis of the notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive response filed by the petitioners and the inadequate response from any respondent interested party, the Department conducted expedited sunset reviews of these orders pursuant to section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C).

As a result of its reviews, the Department determined that revocation of the AD orders from Spain and the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Therefore, the Department notified the ITC of the magnitude of the margins likely to prevail should the orders be revoked, pursuant to sections 751(c)(1) and 752(b) and (c) of the Act.

On November 22, 2016, the ITC published its determination that revocation of the AD orders on chlorinated isos from Spain and the PRC would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of material injury to an industry in the United States within a reasonably foreseeable time, pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act.

**Scope of the Orders**

The products covered by the orders are chlorinated isos, which are derivatives of cyanuric acid, described as chlorinated s-triazine triones. There are three primary chemical compositions of chlorinated isos: (1) Trichloroisocyanuric acid (Cl₃NCO), (2) sodium dichloroisocyanurate (dehydrate) (NaCl₂(NCO)₂(2H₂O), and (3) sodium dichloroisocyanurate (anhydrous) (NaCl₂(NCO)). The orders cover all chlorinated isos. Chlorinated isos are currently classifiable under subheadings 2933.69.6015, 2933.69.021, 2933.69.6050, 3808.40.5000, 3808.50.4000 and 3808.94.5000 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (“HTSUS”). The tariff classification 2933.69.6015 covers sodium dichloroisocyanurates (anhydrous and dehydrate forms) and trichloroisocyanuric acid. The tariff classifications 2933.69.6021 and 2933.69.6050 represent basket categories that include chlorinated isos and other compounds including an unfused triazine ring. Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this order is dispositive.

**Continuation of the Orders**

As a result of the determinations by the Department and the ITC that revocation of the AD orders would likely lead to a continuation or recurrence of dumping and material injury to an industry in the United States, pursuant to section 751(d)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(a), the
Department hereby orders the continuation of the AD orders on chlorinated isocyanurates from Spain and the PRC. U.S. Customs and Border Protection will continue to collect AD cash deposits at the rates in effect at the time of entry for all imports of subject merchandise.

The effective date of the continuation of the AD orders will be the date of publication in the Federal Register of this notice of continuation. Pursuant to section 751(c)(2) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(c)(2), the Department intends to initiate the next five-year review of these orders not later than 30 days prior to the fifth anniversary of the effective date of this continuation notice.

These five-year sunset reviews and this notice are in accordance with section 751(c) and 751(d)(2) of the Act and published pursuant to section 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4).

Administrative Protective Order
This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return/destruction or conversion to judicial protective order of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO which may be subject to sanctions.

This five-year (sunset) review and notice are in accordance with section 751(c) and published pursuant to section 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.218(f)(4).


Paul Piquado,
Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2016–28702 Filed 11–28–16; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–05–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
International Trade Administration
[C–533–872]

Finished Carbon Steel Flanges From India: Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) preliminarily determines that countervailable subsidies are being provided to producers and exporters of finished carbon steel flanges (steel flanges) from India. The period of investigation (POI) is April 1, 2015, through March 31, 2016. Interested parties are invited to comment on this preliminary determination.


FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Emily Maloof or Davina Friedman, AD/CVD Operations, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–5649 or (202) 482–0698, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background
On July 28, 2016, the Department published the notice of initiation of this investigation.¹ For a complete description of the events that followed the initiation of this investigation, see the memorandum that is dated concurrently with this determination and hereby adopted by this notice.² A list of topics included in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum is included as Appendix II to this notice. The Preliminary Decision Memorandum is a public document and is on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce building. In addition, a complete version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum can be found at http://enforcement.trade.gov/ftm/. The signed Preliminary Decision Memorandum and the electronic version of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

Scope of the Investigation
The product covered by this investigation is steel flanges from India. For a complete description of the scope of the investigation, see Appendix I.

Scope Comments
We received no comments from interested parties regarding the scope of the investigation as it appeared in the Initiation Notice.

¹ See Finished Carbon Steel Flanges From India: Preliminary Countervailing Duty Investigation, 81 FR 49625 (July 28, 2016) (Initiation Notice).
³ See sections 771(5)(B) and (D) of the Act regarding financial contribution; section 771(5)(E) of the Act regarding benefit; and section 771(5)(A) of the Act regarding specificity.
⁴ See Preliminary Decision Memorandum at “CALCULATION OF THE ALL–OTHERS RATE” (for further explanation of the business proprietary information concerns); see also Memorandum to the File, “Countervailing Duty Investigation of Finished Carbon Steel Flanges: Preliminary Determination Margin Calculation for All-Others,” dated concurrently with this memorandum.

Methodology
The Department is conducting this countervailing duty (CVD) investigation in accordance with section 701 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act). For each of the subsidy programs found countervailable, we preliminarily determine that there is a subsidy (i.e., a financial contribution by an “authority” that gives rise to a benefit to the recipient) and that the subsidy is specific.³ For a full description of the methodology underlying our preliminary conclusions, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

Preliminary Determination and Suspension of Liquidation
In accordance with section 703(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, we calculated a CVD rate for each individually-investigated producer/exporter of the subject merchandise. We preliminarily determine that countervailable subsidies are being provided with respect to the manufacture, production, or exportation of the subject merchandise. For a full description of the programs which have preliminarily determined to be countervailable, as well as those not used during the POI, see the Preliminary Decision Memorandum. In accordance with sections 703(d) and 705(c)(5)(A) of the Act, for companies not individually examined, we apply an “all-others” rate, which is normally calculated by weight-averaging the individual company subsidy rates of each of the companies investigated.

Under section 705(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, the all-others rate should exclude zero and de minimis rates or any rates based entirely on facts otherwise available pursuant to section 776 of the Act. Neither of the mandatory respondents’ rates in this preliminary determination were zero or de minimis or based entirely on facts otherwise available. Notwithstanding the language of section 705(c)(5)(A)(i) of the Act, we have not calculated the “all-others” rate by weight-averaging the rates of the two individually investigated respondents, because doing so risks disclosure of proprietary information. Instead, we have calculated the all-others rate using a simple average of the final rates for the two mandatory company respondents.⁴