

during the meeting, comments must be received no later than 5 p.m. EDT on Wednesday, June 21, 2017, to ensure transmission to the Board prior to the meeting. Comments received after that date and time will be distributed to the members but may not be considered during the meeting. Copies of Board meeting minutes will be available within 90 days of the meeting.

Dated: June 6, 2017.

Brian Beall,

Executive Secretary, United States Travel and Tourism Advisory Board.

[FR Doc. 2017-12047 Filed 6-9-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DR-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-900]

Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof From the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015

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

SUMMARY: On December 9, 2016, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades and parts thereof (diamond sawblades) from the People’s Republic of China (the PRC). The period of review (POR) is November 1, 2014, through October 31, 2015. For the final results, we continue to find that certain companies covered by this review made sales of subject merchandise at less than normal value.

DATES: Effective June 12, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Yang Jin Chun or Bryan Hansen, AD/CVD Operations, Office I, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of

Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5760 and (202) 482-3683, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 9, 2016, the Department published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades from the PRC.¹ We received case and rebuttal briefs with respect to the *Preliminary Results*. The deadline for the final results of this review is June 7, 2017. We conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Scope of the Order

The merchandise subject to the order is diamond sawblades. The diamond sawblades subject to the order are currently classifiable under subheadings 8202 to 8206 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), and may also enter under subheading 6804.21.00. The HTSUS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes. A full description of the scope of the order is contained in the Issues and Decision Memorandum.² The written description is dispositive.

Analysis of Comments Received

All issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs by parties to this administrative review are addressed in the Issues and Decision Memorandum. A list of the issues raised is attached to this notice as an appendix. The Issues and Decision 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 <http://access.trade.gov> and to all parties in the Central Records Unit, Room B8024 of the main Department of Commerce

building. In addition, a complete version of the Issues and Decision Memorandum can be accessed directly on the Enforcement and Compliance Web site at <http://enforcement.trade.gov/frn/index.html>.

Final Determination of No Shipments

We preliminarily found that Danyang City Ou Di Ma Tools Co., Ltd., Danyang Tsunda Diamond Tools Co., Ltd., Qingdao Hyosung Diamond Tools Co., Ltd., Qingdao Shinhan Diamond Industrial Co., Ltd., and Shanghai Starcraft Tools Co., Ltd., which have been eligible for separate rates in previous segments of the proceeding and are subject to this review, did not have any reviewable entries of subject merchandise during the POR.³ After the *Preliminary Results*, we received no comments or additional information with respect to these five companies. Therefore, for the final results, we continue to find that these five companies did not have any reviewable entries of subject merchandise during the POR. Consistent with our practice, we will issue appropriate instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) based on our final results.

Separate Rates

The Department preliminarily determined that 24 respondents are eligible to receive separate rates in this review.⁴ We made no changes to these determinations for the final results.

Changes Since the Preliminary Results

We made revisions to the *Preliminary Results* following our findings in the verification of Bosun Tools Co., Ltd.’s U.S. sales.

Final Results of the Review

As a result of this administrative review, we determine that the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period November 1, 2014, through October 31, 2015:

Company	Margin (percent)
Bosun Tools Co., Ltd	6.19
Chengdu Huifeng Diamond Tools Co., Ltd	6.19
Danyang Hantronic Import & Export Co., Ltd	6.19
Danyang Huachang Diamond Tools Manufacturing Co., Ltd	6.19
Danyang Like Tools Manufacturing Co., Ltd	6.19
Danyang NYCL Tools Manufacturing Co., Ltd	6.19
Danyang Weiwang Tools Manufacturing Co., Ltd	6.19

¹ See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014–2015*, 81 FR 89045 (December 9, 2016) (*Preliminary Results*), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum.

² See the Memorandum, “Issues and Decision Memorandum for the Administrative Review of the Antidumping Duty Order on Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China,” (Issues and Decision Memorandum) dated concurrently with and hereby adopted by this notice, at 4.

³ See *Preliminary Results*, 81 FR at 89045, n.2, and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum at 3.

⁴ See *Preliminary Results*, 81 FR at 89045, n.6, and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum at 4–8.

Company	Margin (percent)
Guilin Tebon Superhard Material Co., Ltd	6.19
Hangzhou Deer King Industrial and Trading Co., Ltd	6.19
Hangzhou Kingburg Import & Export Co., Ltd	6.19
Huzhou Gu's Import & Export Co., Ltd	6.19
Jiangsu Fengtai Single Entity ⁵	82.05
Jiangsu Inter-China Group Corporation	6.19
Jiangsu Youhe Tool Manufacturer Co., Ltd	6.19
Qingyuan Shangtai Diamond Tools Co., Ltd	6.19
Quanzhou Zhongzhi Diamond Tool Co., Ltd	6.19
Rizhao Hein Saw Co., Ltd	6.19
Saint-Gobain Abrasives (Shanghai) Co., Ltd	6.19
Shanghai Jingquan Industrial Trade Co., Ltd	6.19
Sino Tools Co., Ltd	6.19
Weihai Xiangguang Mechanical Industrial Co., Ltd	6.19
Wuhan Wanbang Laser Diamond Tools Co., Ltd ⁶	6.19
Xiamen ZL Diamond Technology Co., Ltd	6.19
Zhejiang Wanli Tools Group Co., Ltd	6.19

Assessment

Pursuant to section 751(a)(2)(A) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.212(b), the Department shall determine, and CBP shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries covered by this review.⁷ For a customer or importer of Bosun Tools Co., Ltd., we have calculated a customer/importer-specific ad valorem antidumping duty assessment rate in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

For the Jiangsu Fengtai Single Entity, we will instruct CBP to apply an antidumping duty assessment rate of 82.05 percent to all entries of subject merchandise that entered the United States during the POR. For all non-selected respondents that received a separate rate, we will instruct CBP to apply an antidumping duty assessment rate of 6.19 percent⁸ to all entries of subject merchandise that entered the United States during the POR. For all other companies, we will instruct CBP to apply the antidumping duty assessment rate of the PRC-wide entity, 82.05 percent, to all entries of subject merchandise exported by these companies.⁹

⁵ We continue to treat Jiangsu Fengtai Diamond Tool Manufacture Co., Ltd., Jiangsu Fengtai Tools Co., Ltd., and Jiangsu Fengtai Sawing Industry Co., Ltd., as a single entity. See *Preliminary Results*, 81 FR at 89046, and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum at 2, n.4 for details.

⁶ Wuhan Wanbang Laser Diamond Tools Co., Ltd., is the successor-in-interest to Wuhan Wanbang Laser Diamond Tools Co. See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Changed Circumstances Review*, 81 FR 20618 (April 8, 2016).

⁷ See 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1).

⁸ See Issues and Decision Memorandum at 5–6.

⁹ See *Initiation Notice*, 81 FR at 737 (“All firms listed below that wish to qualify for separate rate status in the administrative reviews involving NME countries must complete, as appropriate, either a separate rate application or certification, as described below.”).

For entries that were not reported in the U.S. sales databases submitted by Bosun Tools Co., Ltd., the Department will instruct CBP to liquidate such entries at the PRC-wide rate. In addition, for the five companies that we determined had no reviewable entries of the subject merchandise in this review period, any suspended entries that entered under that exporter's case number (*i.e.*, at that exporter's rate) will be liquidated at the PRC-wide rate.

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

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 from the PRC entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date as provided by section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act: (1) For subject merchandise exported by the companies listed above that have separate rates, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established in these final results of review for each exporter as listed above; (2) for previously investigated or reviewed PRC and non-PRC exporters not listed above that received a separate rate in a prior segment of this proceeding, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the exporter-specific rate; (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 that for the PRC-wide entity; (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 that supplied that non-PRC exporter. These

deposit requirements shall remain in effect until further notice.

Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a final reminder to 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of the antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

Administrative Protective Orders

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely written notification of the return or destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and terms of an APO is a violation subject to sanction.

These final results of review are issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i) of the Act.

Dated: June 6, 2017.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

Appendix

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Scope of the Order
- IV. Surrogate Country
- V. Separate Rates
- VI. Discussion of the Issues
 - a. Adverse Facts Available

- b. Differential Pricing
 - c. Value-Added Tax
 - d. Surrogate Values
- VII. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2017-12106 Filed 6-9-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), Article 1904 Binational Panel Review: Notice of NAFTA Panel Decision

AGENCY: United States Section, NAFTA Secretariat, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of NAFTA Panel Decision in the matter of Supercalendered Paper from Canada: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination (Secretariat File Number: USA-CDA-2015-1904-01).

SUMMARY: On April 13, 2017, the Binational Panel issued its Memorandum Opinion and Order in the matter of Supercalendered Paper from Canada: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination (Final Determination). The Binational Panel affirmed in part and remanded in part the Final Determination by the United States Department of Commerce (Commerce) and copies of the NAFTA Panel Decision are available from the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul E. Morris, United States Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat, Room 2061, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, (202) 482-5438.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Chapter 19 of Article 1904 of NAFTA provides a dispute settlement mechanism involving trade remedy determinations issued by the Government of the United States, the Government of Canada, and the Government of Mexico. Following a Request for Panel Review, a Binational Panel is composed to review the trade remedy determination being challenged and issue a binding Panel Decision. There are established *NAFTA Rules of Procedure for Article 1904 Binational Panel Reviews* (Rules) and the NAFTA Panel Decision has been notified in accordance with Rule 70. For the complete Rules, please see <https://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/Home/Texts-of-the-Agreement/Rules-of-Procedure/Article-1904>.

Panel Decision: On April 13, 2017, the Binational Panel issued its

Memorandum Opinion and Order which affirmed in part and remanded in part the Final Determination by Commerce. The Binational Panel concluded and ordered that Commerce's Final Determination is remanded for further consideration consistent with the Panel's decision with respect to (1) the use of Commerce's "concurrent subsidies" methodology to analyze the provision of "hot idle" funding to Port Hawkesbury Paper LLP (PHP) in a transaction between private parties; (2) Commerce's conclusion that the Government of Nova Scotia entrusted and directed Nova Scotia Power, Inc. to make a financial contribution by providing electricity; (3) Commerce's conclusion that Nova Scotia Power, Inc. provided electricity for less than adequate remuneration, addressing both its conclusion that a Tier 1 benchmark was not available and its calculation of a Tier 3 benchmark; (4) the use of Commerce's "concurrent subsidies methodology" with respect to granting of Forestry Infrastructure monies to New Page Port Hawkesbury (NPPH) prior to its acquisition by Pacific West Commercial Corporation (PWCC); (5) Commerce's statement that the administrative record contains no evidence of a hostile takeover of Fibrek by Resolute; (6) Commerce's failure to examine whether the grants to Resolute under the Northern Industrial Electricity Rate and Forestry Sector Prosperity Funds programs were tied to the production of a particular product or to the production of an input product; and (7) Commerce's use of the same non-recurring grant as the source for Adverse Facts Available for both recurring and non-recurring grants.

The Binational Panel ordered that to the extent not rendered moot by Commerce's explanation on remand as to why a Tier 1 benchmark for measuring the adequacy of remuneration of Port Hawkesbury's electricity was not available, Commerce's October 21, 2016 motion for a voluntary remand to consider whether Commerce should include a separate component for return on equity in its Tier 3 benchmark for measuring the adequacy of remuneration of Port Hawkesbury's electricity is granted, and the calculation of the benchmark for such purchases is hereby remanded. The Binational Panel further ordered that the Final Determination in all other respects is sustained and directed Commerce to submit its redetermination on remand within 75 days of the date of issue of the NAFTA Panel Decision. For the full Memorandum Opinion and Order, please see [\[alena.org/Home/Dispute-Settlement/Decisions-and-Reports\]\(https://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/Home/Dispute-Settlement/Decisions-and-Reports\).](https://www.nafta-sec-</p>
</div>
<div data-bbox=)

Dated: June 6, 2017.

Paul E. Morris,

U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.

[FR Doc. 2017-12039 Filed 6-9-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-201-845]

Antidumping Suspension Agreement on Sugar From Mexico: Rescission of 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 Administrative Reviews

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

SUMMARY: On May 1, 2017, the Department notified the producers/exporters that were signatories to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on sugar from Mexico (the AD Agreement) of its intent to terminate the AD Agreement unless a new agreement was reached on or before June 5, 2017. The Department subsequently modified its notice of intent to terminate the AD Agreement, stating its continued intent to terminate the AD Agreement unless an amended agreement was reached on or before June 6, 2017. Because the Department intends to terminate the AD Agreement, or, in the alternative, amend the AD Agreement prior to the expiration of the termination period, the two ongoing administrative reviews of the original AD Agreement are now moot, and the Department is rescinding both administrative reviews.

DATES: Effective June 5, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Sally C. Gannon or David Cordell, Enforcement & Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0162 or (202) 482-0408.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Investigation and Issuance of the AD Agreement

On April 17, 2014, the Department initiated an antidumping duty investigation under section 732 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), to determine whether imports of sugar from Mexico are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than