

15 days of the date of initiation, the review will continue.

Thereafter, any interested party wishing to participate in the Sunset Review must provide substantive comments in response to the notice of initiation no later than 30 days after the date of initiation.

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: December 20, 2019.

**James Maeder,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2019-28345 Filed 12-31-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### **Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review**

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

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brenda E. Brown, Office of AD/CVD Operations, Customs Liaison Unit, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-4735.

#### **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

##### **Background**

Each year during the anniversary month of the publication of an antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspended investigation, an interested party, as defined in section 771(9) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), may request, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213, that the Department of Commerce (Commerce) conduct an administrative review of that antidumping or countervailing duty order, finding, or suspended investigation.

All deadlines for the submission of comments or actions by Commerce discussed below refer to the number of calendar days from the applicable starting date.

##### **Respondent Selection**

In the event Commerce limits the number of respondents for individual examination for administrative reviews initiated pursuant to requests made for the orders identified below, Commerce intends to select respondents based on

U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data for U.S. imports during the period of review. We intend to release the CBP data under Administrative Protective Order (APO) to all parties having an APO within five days of publication of the initiation notice and to make our decision regarding respondent selection within 21 days of publication of the initiation **Federal Register** notice. Therefore, we encourage all parties interested in commenting on respondent selection to submit their APO applications on the date of publication of the initiation notice, or as soon thereafter as possible. Commerce invites comments regarding the CBP data and respondent selection within five days of placement of the CBP data on the record of the review.

In the event Commerce decides it is necessary to limit individual examination of respondents and conduct respondent selection under section 777A(c)(2) of the Act:

In general, Commerce finds that determinations concerning whether particular companies should be “collapsed” (*i.e.*, treated as a single entity for purposes of calculating antidumping duty rates) require a substantial amount of detailed information and analysis, which often require follow-up questions and analysis. Accordingly, Commerce will not conduct collapsing analyses at the respondent selection phase of a review and will not collapse companies at the respondent selection phase unless there has been a determination to collapse certain companies in a previous segment of this antidumping proceeding (*i.e.*, investigation, administrative review, new shipper review or changed circumstances review). For any company subject to a review, if Commerce determined, or continued to treat, that company as collapsed with others, Commerce will assume that such companies continue to operate in the same manner and will collapse them for respondent selection purposes. Otherwise, Commerce will not collapse companies for purposes of respondent selection. Parties are requested to (a) identify which companies subject to review previously were collapsed, and (b) provide a citation to the proceeding in which they were collapsed. Further, if companies are requested to complete a Quantity and Value Questionnaire for purposes of respondent selection, in general each company must report volume and value data separately for itself. Parties should not include data for any other party, even if they believe they should be treated as a single entity with that other party. If a company was collapsed with another company or

companies in the most recently completed segment of a proceeding where Commerce considered collapsing that entity, complete quantity and value data for that collapsed entity must be submitted.

#### **Deadline for Withdrawal of Request for Administrative Review**

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), a party that requests a review may withdraw that request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. The regulation provides that Commerce may extend this time if it is reasonable to do so. Determinations by Commerce to extend the 90-day deadline will be made on a case-by-case basis.

#### **Deadline for Particular Market Situation Allegation**

Section 504 of the Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015 amended the Act by adding the concept of particular market situation (PMS) for purposes of constructed value under section 773(e) of the Act.<sup>1</sup> Section 773(e) of the Act states that “if a particular market situation exists such that the cost of materials and fabrication or other processing of any kind does not accurately reflect the cost of production in the ordinary course of trade, the administering authority may use another calculation methodology under this subtitle or any other calculation methodology.” When an interested party submits a PMS allegation pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act, Commerce will respond to such a submission consistent with 19 CFR 351.301(c)(2)(v). If Commerce finds that a PMS exists under section 773(e) of the Act, then it will modify its dumping calculations appropriately.

Neither section 773(e) of the Act nor 19 CFR 351.301(c)(2)(v) set a deadline for the submission of PMS allegations and supporting factual information. However, in order to administer section 773(e) of the Act, Commerce must receive PMS allegations and supporting factual information with enough time to consider the submission. Thus, should an interested party wish to submit a PMS allegation and supporting new factual information pursuant to section 773(e) of the Act, it must do so no later than 20 days after submission of initial Section D responses.

*Opportunity To Request a Review:* Not later than the last day of January 2020,<sup>2</sup> interested parties may request

<sup>1</sup> See Trade Preferences Extension Act of 2015, Public Law 114-27, 129 Stat. 362 (2015).

<sup>2</sup> Or the next business day, if the deadline falls on a weekend, federal holiday or any other day when Commerce is closed.

administrative review of the following orders, findings, or suspended investigations, with anniversary dates in January for the following periods:

	Period of review
<b>Antidumping Duty Proceedings</b>	
BELARUS: Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod, A-822-806 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
BRAZIL: Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Stand, A-351-837 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
CANADA: Softwood Lumber, A-122-857 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
INDIA: Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand, A-533-828 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
MEXICO: Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand, A-201-831 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
REPUBLIC OF KOREA: Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand, A-580-852 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
RUSSIA: Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod, A-821-824 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
SOUTH AFRICA: Ferrovandium, A-791-815 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
THAILAND: Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand, A-549-820 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA:	
Calcium Hypochlorite, A-570-008 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod, A-570-012 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Crepe Paper Products, A-570-895 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Ferrovandium, A-570-873 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Folding Gift Boxes, A-570-866 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Hardwood Plywood Products, A-570-051 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Potassium Permanganate, A-570-001 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Wooden Bedroom Furniture, A-570-890 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
UNITED ARAB EMIRATES: Carbon and Alloy Steel Wire Rod, A-520-808 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
<b>Countervailing Duty Proceedings</b>	
ARGENTINA: Biodiesel, C-357-821 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
CANADA: Softwood Lumber, C-122-858 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
INDONESIA: Biodiesel, C-560-831 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA:	
Calcium Hypochlorite, C-570-009 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Carbon and Certain Alloy Steel Wire Rod, C-570-013 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Circular Welded Carbon Quality Steel Line Pipe, C-570-936 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Hardwood Plywood Products, C-570-052 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
Oil Country Tubular Goods, C-570-944 .....	1/1/18-12/31/18
Tool Chests and Cabinets, C-570-057 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19
<b>Suspension Agreements</b>	
RUSSIA: Certain Cut-To-Length Carbon Steel Plate, A-821-808 .....	1/1/19-12/31/19

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), an interested party as defined by section 771(9) of the Act may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. For both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order or suspension agreement for which it is requesting a review. In addition, a domestic interested party or an interested party described in section 771(9)(B) of the Act must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which was produced in more than one country of origin and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Note that, for any party Commerce was unable to locate in prior segments, Commerce will not accept a request for an administrative review of that party absent new information as to the party's location. Moreover, if the interested party who files a request for review is unable to locate the producer or exporter for which it requested the review, the interested party must provide an explanation of the attempts it made to locate the producer or exporter at the same time it files its request for review, in order for the Secretary to determine if the interested party's attempts were reasonable, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.303(f)(3)(ii). As explained in *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 68 FR 23954 (May 6, 2003), and *Non-Market Economy Antidumping Proceedings: Assessment of Antidumping Duties*, 76 FR 65694 (October 24, 2011), Commerce clarified its practice with respect to the collection of final antidumping duties on imports of merchandise where intermediate firms are involved. The public should be aware of this

clarification in determining whether to request an administrative review of merchandise subject to antidumping findings and orders.<sup>3</sup>

Commerce no longer considers the non-market economy (NME) entity as an exporter conditionally subject to an antidumping duty administrative reviews.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, the NME entity will not be under review unless Commerce specifically receives a request for, or self-initiates, a review of the NME entity.<sup>5</sup> In administrative reviews of antidumping duty orders on merchandise from NME countries where a review of the NME entity has not been initiated, but where an individual exporter for which a review was

<sup>3</sup> See also the Enforcement and Compliance website at <http://trade.gov/enforcement/>.

<sup>4</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).

<sup>5</sup> In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1), parties should specify that they are requesting a review of entries from exporters comprising the entity, and to the extent possible, include the names of such exporters in their request.

initiated does not qualify for a separate rate, Commerce will issue a final decision indicating that the company in question is part of the NME entity. However, in that situation, because no review of the NME entity was conducted, the NME entity's entries were not subject to the review and the rate for the NME entity is not subject to change as a result of that review (although the rate for the individual exporter may change as a function of the finding that the exporter is part of the NME entity). Following initiation of an antidumping administrative review when there is no review requested of the NME entity, Commerce will instruct CBP to liquidate entries for all exporters not named in the initiation notice, including those that were suspended at the NME entity rate.

All requests must be filed electronically in Enforcement and Compliance's Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Centralized Electronic Service System (ACCESS) on Enforcement and Compliance's ACCESS website at <http://access.trade.gov>.<sup>6</sup> Further, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.303(f)(1)(i), a copy of each request must be served on the petitioner and each exporter or producer specified in the request.

Commerce will publish in the **Federal Register** a notice of "Initiation of Administrative Review of Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation" for requests received by the last day of January 2020. If Commerce does not receive, by the last day of January 2020, a request for review of entries covered by an order, finding, or suspended investigation listed in this notice and for the period identified above, Commerce will instruct CBP to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

For the first administrative review of any order, there will be no assessment of antidumping or countervailing duties on entries of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during the relevant provisional-measures "gap" period of the order, if such a gap period is applicable to the period of review.

<sup>6</sup> See *Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Proceedings: Electronic Filing Procedures; Administrative Protective Order Procedures*, 76 FR 39263 (July 6, 2011).

This notice is not required by statute but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: December 18, 2019.

**James Maeder,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.*

[FR Doc. 2019-28342 Filed 12-31-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A-570-900]

#### **Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Results of Review and Amended Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015**

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

**SUMMARY:** On December 16, 2019, the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) sustained the final remand redetermination pertaining to the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on diamond sawblades and parts thereof from the People's Republic of China covering the period November 1, 2014 through October 31, 2015. The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is notifying the public that the CIT's final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the final results of the administrative review and that Commerce is amending the final results with respect to certain respondents eligible for separate rates.

*Applicable date:* December 26, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Yang Jin Chun or Minoo Hatten, 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 or (202) 482-1690, respectively.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

#### **Background**

On June 12, 2017, Commerce published the *Final Results*, in which we accepted an alternative sales identification methodology for Bosun Tools Co., Ltd. (Bosun), calculated a margin for Bosun, and assigned the margin for Bosun to the non-selected separate rate respondents.<sup>1</sup> On October

<sup>1</sup> See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of*

23, 2018, the CIT remanded the *Final Results* to Commerce to: (1) Further clarify or reconsider Commerce's conclusion that Bosun acted to the best of its ability in responding to Commerce's requests for information; and (2) further explain Commerce's selection of surrogate values for copper powder and copper iron clab.<sup>2</sup>

In the final remand redetermination, we found that Bosun had not acted to the best of its ability in responding to our request for information and determined Bosun's margin entirely on the basis of the facts available with an adverse inference (AFA). Because we applied AFA to Bosun, the issue concerning the surrogate value for copper powder and copper iron clab was moot.<sup>3</sup> On December 16, 2019, the CIT sustained our final remand redetermination in its entirety.<sup>4</sup>

#### **Timken Notice**

In its decision in *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*), as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010), the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), Commerce must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Commerce determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision. The CIT's December 16, 2019, final judgment sustaining the final remand redetermination constitutes the CIT's final decision which is not "in harmony" with the *Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, Commerce will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise pending expiration of the period to appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision.

#### **Amended Final Results of Review**

Because there is now a final court decision, Commerce is amending the *Final Results* with respect to Bosun and

*Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015*, 82 FR 26912 (June 12, 2017) (*Final Results*).

<sup>2</sup> See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 17-00167, Slip Op. 18-146 (CIT Oct. 23, 2018).

<sup>3</sup> See Final Remand Redetermination dated April 17, 2019, pursuant to *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 17-00167, Slip Op. 18-146 (CIT Oct. 23, 2018), available at <https://enforcement.trade.gov/remands/18-146.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> See *Diamond Sawblades Manufacturers' Coalition v. United States*, Court No. 17-00167, Slip Op. 19-157 (CIT Dec. 16, 2019).