

solutions that are provided, and understand the impact and consequences of administering the competition and developing solutions for submission. Information may be collected during the competition or after its completion. The submissions are evaluated by the submitting agency and typically prizes (monetary and non-monetary) are awarded to the winning entries.

This clearance applies to challenges posted on *Challenge.gov*, which uses a common platform for the solicitation of challenges from the public. Each agency designs the criteria for its solicitations based on the goals of the challenge and the specific needs of the agency. There is no standard submission format for solution providers to follow.

We anticipate that approximately 250 challenges would be issued each year by DOC. It is expected that other federal agencies will issue a similar number of challenges. There is no set schedule for the issuance of challenges; they are developed and issued on an “as needs” basis in response to issues the federal agency wishes to solve. The respondents to the challenges, who are participating voluntarily, are unlikely to reply to more than one or several of the challenges.

Although in previous memoranda the GSA and Office of Management and Budget (OMB) described circumstances whereby OMB approval of a PRA request is not needed, program officials at DOC have identified several sets of information that will typically need to be requested of solution providers to enable the solutions to be adequately evaluated by the program office issuing the challenge. These requests for additional information have been suggested to require a PRA review as they represent structured data requests.

There are three types of additional data that may routinely be requested. These include the following:

Title and/or Subject of the submission. Due to the nature of the submission and evaluation processes, it is important that a title and/or subject be requested and submitted for each submission to ensure the solution is correctly identified with its provider.

Identification of data resources. In many cases, the solution to a problem will require the solution provider to use data resources. Often, the nature of the data sets will be derived from Federal data resources, such as *data.gov*. Evaluations of solutions will often depend on the understanding of the selection of the data resource(s) used in the solution.

Description of methodology. For effective judging and evaluation, a

description of the development methods for the solution to the challenge will be requested. For instance, a prize may be awarded to the solution of a challenge to develop an algorithm that enables reliable prediction of a certain event. A responder could submit the correct algorithm, but without the methodology, the evaluation process could not be adequately performed.

Affected Public: Individuals or households; Business or other for-profit organizations; Not-for-profit institutions; State, Local, or Tribal government; Federal government.

Frequency: As needed.

Respondent's Obligation: Voluntary.

Legal Authority: 15 U.S.C. 3701 *et seq.*

This information collection request may be viewed at www.reginfo.gov.

Follow the instructions to view the Department of Commerce collections currently under review by OMB.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be submitted within 30 days of the publication of this notice on the following website www.reginfo.gov/public/do/PRAMain. Find this particular information collection by selecting “Currently under 30-day Review—Open for Public Comments” or by using the search function and entering either the title of the collection or the OMB Control Number 0690–0031.

Sheleen Dumas,

Department PRA Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Commerce Department.

[FR Doc. 2020–14644 Filed 7–7–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–13–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

In the Matter of: Mahin Mojtahedzadeh a.k.a. Mahin Toussi, Mojtahedzadeh a.k.a. Mahin Mojtahedzadeh Toussi No 63, Aghaghia 3, Milad 16, Sajjad BLVD, Mashhad. Iran; Order Denying Export Privileges

On January 30, 2020, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of New York, Mahin Mojtahedzadeh, a.k.a. Mahin Toussi Mojtahedzadeh, a.k.a. Mahin Mojtahedzadeh Toussi (“Mojtahedzadeh”), was convicted of violating the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. § 1701, *et seq.* (2012)) (“IEEPA”). Specifically, Mojtahedzadeh was convicted of violating IEEPA by conspiring to unlawfully export gas turbine parts from the United States to Iran without having first obtained the required U.S.

Government authorization.

Mojtahedzadeh was sentenced to time served, a \$100 special assessment and a fine of \$5,000.

Pursuant to Section 1760(e) of the Export Control Reform Act (“ECRA”),² the export privileges of any person who has been convicted of certain offenses, including, but not limited to, IEEPA, may be denied for a period of up to ten (10) years from the date of his/her conviction. 50 U.S.C. 4819(e) (Prior Convictions). In addition, any BIS licenses or other authorizations issued under ECRA in which the person had an interest at the time of the conviction may be revoked. *Id.*

BIS received notice of Mojtahedzadeh’s conviction for violating IEEPA, and has provided notice and opportunity for Mojtahedzadeh to make a written submission to BIS, as provided in Section 766.25 of the Export Administration Regulations (“EAR” or the “Regulations”). 15 CFR 766.25.³ BIS has not received a written submission from Mojtahedzadeh.

Based upon my review of the record and consultations with BIS’s Office of Export Enforcement, including its Director, and the facts available to BIS, I have decided to deny Mojtahedzadeh’s export privileges under the Regulations for a period of 10 years from the date of Mojtahedzadeh’s conviction. I have also decided to revoke any BIS-issued licenses in which Mojtahedzadeh had an interest at the time of her conviction.

Accordingly, it is hereby *ordered*:

First, from the date of this Order until January 30, 2030, Mahin Mojtahedzadeh, a.k.a. Mahin Toussi Mojtahedzadeh, a.k.a. Mahin Mojtahedzadeh Toussi, with a last known address of No 63, Aghaghia 3,

² ECRA was enacted as part of the John S. McCain National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2019, and as amended is codified at 50 U.S.C. 4801–4852. Mojtahedzadeh’s conviction post-dates ECRA’s enactment on August 13, 2018.

³ The Regulations are currently codified in the Code of Federal Regulations at 15 CFR Parts 730–774 (2020). The Regulations originally issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, 50 U.S.C. 4601–4623 (Supp. III 2015) (“EAA”), which lapsed on August 21, 2001. The President, through Executive Order 13,222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), which was extended by successive Presidential Notices, continued the Regulations in full force and effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, 50 U.S.C. 1701, *et seq.* (2012) (“IEEPA”). Section 1768 of ECRA, 50 U.S.C. 4826, provides in pertinent part that all rules and regulations that were made or issued under the EAA, including as continued in effect pursuant to IEEPA, and were in effect as of ECRA’s date of enactment (August 13, 2018), shall continue in effect according to their terms until modified, superseded, set aside, or revoked through action undertaken pursuant to the authority provided under ECRA. *See* note 1, *supra*.

Milad 16, Sajjad BLVD, Mashhad, Iran, and when acting for or on her behalf, her successors, assigns, employees, agents or representatives (“the Denied Person”), may not directly or indirectly participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as “item”) exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, license exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or engaging in any other activity subject to the Regulations; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Regulations, or from any other activity subject to the Regulations.

Second, no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of the Denied Person any item subject to the Regulations;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by the Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby the Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from the Denied Person of any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such

service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

Third, pursuant to Section 1760(e) of the Export Control Reform Act (50 U.S.C. 4819(e) and Sections 766.23 and 766.25 of the Regulations, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Mojtabezadeh by ownership, control, position of responsibility, affiliation, or other connection in the conduct of trade or business may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order in order to prevent evasion of this Order.

Fourth, in accordance with Part 756 of the Regulations, Mojtabezadeh may file an appeal of this Order with the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security. The appeal must be filed within 45 days from the date of this Order and must comply with the provisions of Part 756 of the Regulations.

Fifth, a copy of this Order shall be delivered to Mojtabezadeh and shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

Sixth, this Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until January 30, 2030.

Issued this 1st day of July, 2020.

Karen H. Nies-Vogel,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 2020–14597 Filed 7–7–20; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DT–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–985]

Xanthan Gum From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Final Amended Final Determination Pursuant to Court Decision

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

SUMMARY: On February 10, 2020, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) reversed the Court of International Trade's (CIT) decision sustaining the Department of Commerce's (Commerce) use of Thai Fermentation Industry Ltd.'s (Thai Fermentation) financial statements to calculate surrogate financial ratios and reinstated Commerce's prior determination to use Ajinomoto (Thailand) Co., Ltd.'s (Thai Ajinomoto) financial statements to calculate financial ratios. Accordingly, Commerce

is issuing a third amended final determination for the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of xanthan gum from the People's Republic of China (China), and including Neimenggu Fufeng Biotechnologies Co., Ltd. (aka Inner Mongolia Fufeng Biotechnologies Co., Ltd.) and Shandong Fufeng Fermentation, Co., Ltd. (collectively, Fufeng) as subject to the order.

DATES: Applicable February 20, 2020.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Hanna, AD/CVD Operations, Office IV, Enforcement and Compliance, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0835.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The litigation in this case relates to Commerce's final determination in the LTFV investigation of xanthan gum from China,¹ which was later amended.² In its *Amended Final Determination and Order*, Commerce reached affirmative determinations for mandatory respondents, Fufeng and Deosen Biochemical Ltd. (Deosen).³ CP Kelco U.S., Inc. (CP Kelco U.S.), the petitioner, and Fufeng appealed the *Amended Final Determination and Order* to the CIT, and on March 31, 2015, the CIT sustained, in part, and remanded, in part, Commerce's *Final Determination*, as modified by the *Amended Final Determination*.⁴ Specifically, the CIT remanded, for reevaluation, Commerce's conclusion that the Thai Ajinomoto financial statements constituted a better source for calculating surrogate financial ratios than the Thai Fermentation statements, and granted Commerce's request for a voluntary remand to reconsider its allocation of energy consumed at Fufeng's Neimenggu plant between the production of subject and non-subject merchandise.⁵

Pursuant to a series of remand orders issued by the CIT that resulted in four remand redeterminations, Commerce adjusted its allocation of energy consumed at Fufeng's Neimenggu plant

¹ See *Xanthan Gum from the People's Republic of China: Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 78 FR 33351 (June 4, 2013) (*Final Determination*) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

² See *Xanthan Gum from the People's Republic of China: Amended Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Antidumping Duty Order*, 78 FR 43143 (July 19, 2013) (*Amended Final Determination and Order*).

³ *Id.*, 78 FR at 43144.

⁴ See *CP Kelco US, Inc. v. United States*, Ct. No. 13–00288, Slip Op. 15–27 (CIT Mar. 31, 2015) (*CP Kelco I*).

⁵ *Id.* at 2–3, 11–15, 32–34.