Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS). ACCESS is available to registered users at *http://access.trade.gov* and 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 accessed directly on the Internet at *http://www/trade.gov/ frn/index.html*. The signed Preliminary Decision Memorandum is identical in content.

# Preliminary Determination of No Shipments

Based on information Terphane submitted after the initiation of this administrative review and information collected from U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP), the Department has preliminarily determined that the record evidence indicates that Terphane currently had no reviewable entries during the POR. In addition, the Department finds that it is not appropriate to rescind the review with respect to Terphane but, rather, to complete the review and issue appropriate instructions to CBP based on the final results of this review, as is our practice.<sup>5</sup>

### **Assessment Rates**

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 these 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 allothers rate if there is no rate for the intermediate company(ies) involved in the transaction. For a full discussion of this clarification, see Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003). We intend to issue assessment instructions directly to CBP 15 days after publication of the final results of this review.

## **Disclosure and Public Comment**

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results and submit written arguments or case briefs within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice, unless otherwise notified by the Department.<sup>6</sup> Parties are reminded that written comments or case briefs are not the place for submitting new factual material. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, will be due five days later.<sup>7</sup> Parties who submit case or rebuttal briefs are requested to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties are requested to provide a summary of the arguments not to exceed five pages and a table of statutes, regulations, and cases cited.

Any interested party who wishes to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance within 30 days after the day of publication of this notice. A request should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed.<sup>8</sup> Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those raised in case briefs. The Department will issue the final results of administrative review, including the results of our analysis of issues raised in any briefs, within 90 days after the date on which the preliminary results were issued, unless the deadline for the final results is extended.9

#### **Notification to Importers**

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to the 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 review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice is published in accordance with sections 751(a)(2)(B) and 777(i) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.214(f).

Dated: August 3, 2015.

#### Ronald K. Lotentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2015–19845 Filed 8–11–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### **DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

#### International Trade Administration

#### [A-570-924]

#### Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review; 2013–2014

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce ("Department") is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip ("PET film") from the People's Republic of China ("PRC") for the period of review ("POR") November 1, 2013, through October 31, 2014. This review covers four PRC companies.<sup>1</sup> The Department is rescinding the review with respect to Fuwei Films (Shandong) Co., Ltd. ("Fuwei Films"), Sichuan Dongfang Insulating Material Co., Ltd. ("Dongfang"), and Tianjin Wanhua Co., Ltd. ("Wanhua"). Further, the Department preliminarily finds that Shaoxing Xiangyu Green Packing Co., Ltd. ("Green Packing") is part of the PRC-wide entity.

DATES: Effective Date: August 12, 2015.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Jonathan Hill, Office IV, Enforcement & Compliance, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3518.

# SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

#### Scope of the Order

The products covered by the order are all gauges of raw, pre-treated, or primed PET film, whether extruded or coextruded.<sup>2</sup> PET film is classifiable under subheading 3920.62.00.90 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States ("HTSUS"). Although the HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Certain Frozen Warmwater Shrimp From Thailand: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke the Order (in Part); 2011–2012, 78 FR 15686 (March 12, 2013) and the accompanying Decision Memorandum at 7 to 8.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii).

<sup>7</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(d).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> See 19 CFR 351.310(c).

<sup>9</sup> See 19 CFR 351.214(i).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews, 79 FR 76956 (December 23, 2014).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For a complete description of the scope of the order, *see* "Decision Memorandum for the Preliminary Results of 2013–2014 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the People's Republic of China," from Christian Marsh, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations to Ronald K. Lorentzen, Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, dated concurrently with this notice ("Preliminary Decision Memorandum").

written description of the scope of the order is dispositive.

## Partial Rescission

On December 1, 2014, Green Packing requested administrative review of subject merchandise exported by itself, and Mitsubishi Polyester Film, Inc. and SKC, Inc. (collectively "Petitioners") requested an administrative review of subject merchandise exported by Dongfang, Fuwei Films, Green Packing, and Wanhua. Subsequently, on March 23, 2015, Petitioners timely withdrew their request for an administrative review of each company. No other parties requested a review with respect to Dongfang, Fuwei Films, and Wanhua. Therefore, the Department, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), is rescinding this administrative review with respect to each company. However, as Green Packing requested administrative review of itself and did not withdraw its request, the Department is continuing its review of Green Packing's exports of subject merchandise during the POR.

#### Methodology

The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751(a)(1)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). For a full description of the methodology underlying our conclusions, see Preliminary Decision Memorandum. This 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/login.aspx and 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 accessed directly on the Internet at http:// enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html/. The signed Preliminary Decision Memorandum and the electronic versions of the Preliminary Decision Memorandum are identical in content.

#### **Preliminary Results of Review**

The Department's change in policy regarding conditional review of the PRC-wide entity applies to this administrative review.<sup>3</sup> Because Green Packing failed to establish that it is entitled to a separate rate for the POR, we are treating Green Packing as part of the PRC-wide entity.<sup>4</sup> The rate previously established for the PRC-wide entity in this proceeding is 76.72 percent.<sup>5</sup>

# **Disclosure and Public Comment**

Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments, filed electronically using ACCESS, within 30 days of the date of publication of these preliminary results of review.<sup>6</sup> Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in the case briefs, will be due five days after the due date for case briefs.<sup>7</sup> Parties who submit case or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue, a summary of the argument not to exceed five pages, and a table of authorities.<sup>8</sup>

Further, interested parties who wish to request a hearing must submit a written request to the Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, within 30 days after the publication of this notice.<sup>9</sup> Electronically filed case briefs/written comments and hearing requests must be received successfully in their entirety by the Department's electronic records system, ACCESS, by 5:00 p.m. Eastern Time, within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice.<sup>10</sup> Hearing requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of issues to be discussed. Issues raised in the hearing will be limited to those issues raised in the respective case briefs. If a request for a hearing is made, parties will be notified of the time and date of the hearing which will be held at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington DC 20230. The Department intends to issue the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of the issues raised in any written briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this

- 7 See 19 CFR 351.309(d).
- <sup>8</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(c).
- 9 See 19 CFR 351.310(c).
- 10 Id.

notice, unless extended, pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

#### **Assessment Rates**

Upon issuance of the final results, the Department will determine, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection ("CBP") shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review.<sup>11</sup> The Department intends to issue assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the publication date of the final results of this review. The Department intends to instruct CBP to liquidate entries of subject merchandise from the PRC-wide entity, including entries of subject merchandise from Green Packing, at 76.72 percent (the PRC-wide rate).<sup>12</sup>

#### **Cash Deposit Requirements**

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of review, as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For the exporters listed above which have a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established in the final results of this review (except, if the rate is zero or de minimis, then a cash deposit rate of zero will be established for that company); (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate published for the most recently completed segment of this proceeding; (3) for all PRC exporters of subject merchandise that have not been found to be entitled to a separate rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate for the PRC-wide entity, 76.72 percent; and (4) for all non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise which have not received their own rate, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC exporter(s) that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until further notice.

#### Notification to Importers

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> See Antidumping Proceedings: Announcement of Change in Department Practice for Respondent Selection in Antidumping Duty Proceedings and Conditional Review of the Nonmarket Economy Entity in NME Antidumping Duty Proceedings, 78 FR 65963 (November 4, 2013). Under this policy, the PRC-wide entity will not be under review unless a party specifically requests, or the

Department self-initiates, a review of the entity. Because no party requested a review of the PRCwide entity in this review, the entity's rate is not subject to change.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> See Preliminary Decision Memorandum. <sup>5</sup> See Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, 73 FR 55039, 55041 (September 24, 2008).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> See 19 CFR 351.309(c).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> For a full discussion of this practice, *see Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 76 FR 65694 (October 24, 2011).

regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

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 and 351.221(b)(4).

Dated: July 30, 2015.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

#### Appendix

#### List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Results Decision Memorandum

Summary Background Partial Rescission Scope of the Order Discussion of the Methodology Non-Market Economy Status PRC-Wide Entity Recommendation [FR Doc. 2015–19359 Filed 8–11–15; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No. 150706577-5577-01]

RIN 0693-XC051

#### Government Use of Standards for Security and Conformance Requirements for Cryptographic Algorithm and Cryptographic Module Testing and Validation Programs

**AGENCY:** National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), Commerce. **ACTION:** Notice; Request for information.

**SUMMARY:** NIST is seeking public comment on the potential use of certain International Organization for Standardization/International Electrotechnical Commission (ISO/IEC) standards for cryptographic algorithm and cryptographic module testing, conformance, and validation activities, currently specified by Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 140–2. The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA) directs federal agencies to adopt voluntary consensus standards wherever possible. The responses to this request for information will be used to plan possible changes to the FIPS or in a decision to use all or part of the ISO/ IEC standards for testing, conformance

and validation of cryptographic algorithms and modules. DATES: Comments on the potential use

of ISO/IEC 19790:2014 must be received no later than 5 p.m., EST on September 28, 2015.

ADDRESSES: Written comments concerning the potential use of ISO/IEC 19790:2014 should be sent to: Information Technology Laboratory, ATTN Use of ISO/IEC 19790, Mail Stop 7730, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive, Gaithersburg, MD 20899.

Electronic comments should be sent to: *UseOfISO@nist.gov.* 

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Diane Honeycutt, telephone (301) 975– 8443, MS 8930, National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899 or via email at *DHoneycutt@nist.gov.* 

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act (NTTAA), Public Law 104-113, directs federal agencies with respect to their use of and participation in the development of voluntary consensus standards. The NTTAA's objective is for federal agencies to adopt voluntary consensus standards, wherever possible, in lieu of creating proprietary, non-consensus standards. As the implementation of commercial cryptography, which is used to protect U.S. non-national security information and information systems, is now commoditized and built, marketed and used globally, NIST is seeking comments on using the ISO/IEC 19790:2014 Security Requirements for Cryptographic Modules standard as the U.S. Federal Standard for cryptographic modules (http://www.iso.org/iso/ catalogue detail.htm?csnumber=59142).

The standards for cryptographic module testing, conformance, and validation activities are currently specified by Federal Information Processing Standard (FIPS) 140–2. This standard is used to ensure encryption technologies used by the U.S. Government meet minimally acceptable requirements and can demonstrate an acceptable level of conformance to the Standard that is commensurate with the risk the U.S. Government finds acceptable when using encryption technologies to protect U.S. Government information and information systems.

NIST is interested in the commercial and market effects to U.S. industry and the potential changes to visibility in cryptographic modules conformance to standards, as well as the ISO/IEC 19790:2014 standards ability to meet requirements for the U.S. Government. NIST is also interested in comments on the possible uses of ISO/IEC 19790:2014 that range from use of only selected sections, continuing with a FIPS requirement that cites a baseline version of the ISO/IEC 19790:2014, and/or full use of the ISO/IEC standard. NIST is also interested in feedback on the impacts of a potential U.S. Government requirement for use and conformance using a standard with a fee-based model where organizations must purchase copies of the ISO/IEC 19790:2014.

NIST is particularly interested in comments from commercial implementers of cryptography, testing and conformance organizations, users of cryptography, and organizations who currently require or cite FIPS 140-2 as a normative reference, on the benefits versus risks in using ISO/IEC 19790:2014 rather than FIPS 140-2 from perspectives of technology, implementations, risks and impacts to commercial IT markets. NIST requests comments on the following questions regarding the use of ISO/IEC 19790:2014, but comments on other cryptographic test and conformance issues will also be considered.

(1) Have your customers or users asked for either ISO/IEC 19790:2014 or FIPS 140–2 validations in cryptographic products?

(2) Have the markets you serve asked for either validation and have you noticed any changes in what the markets you serve are asking for?

(3) Do you think the ISO/IEC 19790:2014 standard specifies tests and provides evidence of conformance for cryptographic algorithms and modules better, equally or less as compared to FIPS 140–2 and in what areas?

(4) Is there a difference in risk that you perceive would be mitigated or accepted in use of one standard versus the other?

(5) Are the requirements in ISO/IEC 19790:2014 specific enough for your organization to develop a cryptographic module that can demonstrate conformance to this standard?

(6) Would the U.S. Government citation of an ISO standard that has a fee for access to the standard inhibit your use or implementation of this standard?

(7) Do either FIPS 140–2 or ISO/IEC 19790:2014 have a gap area that is not required for implementation, test or validation that presents an unacceptable risk to users of cryptographic modules?

The responses to this request for information will be used to plan possible changes to the FIPS or in a decision to use all or part of ISO/IEC 19790:2014 for testing, conformance and validation of cryptographic algorithms and modules. In any decision made, it is the intention of NIST to continue