Email: program.intake@usda.gov

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.), should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720–2600 (voice and TDD).

Theresa Nintemann,

Acting Administrator. [FR Doc. 2021–05734 Filed 3–18–21; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3410–DM–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Economic Development Administration

Notice of Petitions by Firms for Determination of Eligibility To Apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance

AGENCY: Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. **ACTION:** Notice and opportunity for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Economic Development Administration (EDA) has received

petitions for certification of eligibility to apply for Trade Adjustment Assistance from the firms listed below. Accordingly, EDA has initiated investigations to determine whether increased imports into the United States of articles like or directly competitive with those produced by each of the firms contributed importantly to the total or partial separation of the firms' workers, or threat thereof, and to a decrease in sales or production of each petitioning firm.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

LIST OF PETITIONS RECEIVED BY EDA FOR CERTIFICATION OF ELIGIBILITY TO APPLY FOR

TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE

[3/9/2021 through 3/12/2021]

Firm name	Firm address	Date accepted for investigation	Product(s)
WireCo WorldGroup, Inc	2400 West 75th Street, Prairie Village, KS 66208.	3/10/2021	The firm manufactures steel wire and steel rope.
Walker Tool & Die, Inc	2411 Walker Avenue Northwest, Grand Rapids, MI 49544.	3/10/2021	The firm manufactures metal stamping dies.
Kenney Industries, Inc	2110 Panoramic Circle, Dallas, TX 75212.	3/11/2021	The firm manufactures miscellaneous metal parts.
R & J Metal Finishing, Inc	273 Gould Avenue, Depew, NY 14043	3/11/2021	The firm provides metal plating and metal coating services.
Reel Power Industrial, Inc	5101 South Council Road, Oklahoma City, OK 73179.	3/12/2021	The firm manufactures machinery for reeling and coiling.

Any party having a substantial interest in these proceedings may request a public hearing on the matter. A written request for a hearing must be submitted to the Trade Adjustment Assistance Division, Room 71030, Economic Development Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230, no later than ten (10) calendar days following publication of this notice. These petitions are received pursuant to section 251 of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended.

Please follow the requirements set forth in EDA's regulations at 13 CFR 315.9 for procedures to request a public hearing. The Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance official number and title for the program under which these petitions are submitted is 11.313, Trade Adjustment Assistance for Firms.

Bryan Borlik,

Director.

[FR Doc. 2021–05656 Filed 3–18–21; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510–WH–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[B-21-2021]

Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) 99— Wilmington, Delaware; Notification of Proposed Production Activity; AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP (Pharmaceutical Products); Newark, Delaware

AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP (AstraZeneca) submitted a notification of proposed production activity to the FTZ Board for its facility in Newark, Delaware. The notification conforming to the requirements of the regulations of the FTZ Board (15 CFR 400.22) was received on March 11, 2021.

AstraZeneca already has authority to produce certain pharmaceutical products within Subzone 99D. The current request would add finished products and foreign status materials to the scope of authority. Pursuant to 15 CFR 400.14(b), additional FTZ authority would be limited to the specific foreignstatus materials and specific finished products described in the submitted notification (as described below) and subsequently authorized by the FTZ Board.

Production under FTZ procedures could exempt AstraZeneca from customs duty payments on the foreignstatus materials/components used in export production. On its domestic sales, for the foreign-status materials/ components noted below and in the existing scope of authority, AstraZeneca would be able to choose the duty rates during customs entry procedures that apply to: CALQUENCE (acalabrutinib) capsules; DAKLINZA (daclatasvir) tablets; FARXIGA\FORXIGA (dapagliflozin) tablets; KOMBIGLYZE IR (metformin hydrochloride and saxagliptin hydrochloride) tablets; KOMBIGLYZE XR (metformin hydrochloride and saxagliptin hydrochloride) tablets; METFORMIN IR (metformin hydrochloride) tablets; ONGLYZA (saxagliptin hydrochloride) tablets; QTERN (dapagliflozin and saxagliptin hydrochloride) tablets; QTERNMET XR (dapagliflozin, metformin hydrochloride and saxagliptin hydrochloride) tablets; TAGRISSO (osimertinib mesylate) tablets; XIGDUO IR (dapagliflozin and metformin hydrochloride) tablets; XIGDUO XR (dapagliflozin & metformin hydrochloride) tablets; and, CRESTOR (rosuvastatin calcium) tablets (dutyfree). AstraZeneca would be able to

avoid duty on foreign-status components which become scrap/waste. Customs duties also could possibly be deferred or reduced on foreign-status production equipment.

The materials sourced from abroad include: Metformin hydrochloride active pharmaceutical ingredient (API); dapagliflozin API; daclatasvir API; osimertinib mesylate API; acalabrutinib API; saxagliptin hydrochloride API; rosuvastatin calcium API; and, microcrystalline cellulose (duty rate ranges from 3.7% to 6.5%). The request indicates that certain materials are subject to duties under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974 (Section 301), depending on the country of origin. The applicable Section 301 decisions require subject merchandise to be admitted to FTZs in privileged foreign status (19 CFR 146.41).

Public comment is invited from interested parties. Submissions shall be addressed to the Board's Executive Secretary and sent to: *ftz@trade.gov*. The closing period for their receipt is April 28, 2021.

A copy of the notification will be available for public inspection in the "Reading Room" section of the Board's website, which is accessible via www.trade.gov/ftz.

For further information, contact Christopher Wedderburn at *Chris.Wedderburn@trade.gov.*

Dated: March 15, 2021.

Andrew McGilvray,

Executive Secretary. [FR Doc. 2021–05732 Filed 3–18–21; 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 Final Results of the 2015–2016 Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Review

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

SUMMARY: On February 24, 2021, the U.S. Court of International Trade (the Court) entered final judgment sustaining the final results of remand redetermination pursuant to court order by the U.S. Department of Commerce (Commerce) pertaining to the 2015– 2016 antidumping duty (AD) administrative review on diamond sawblades and parts thereof (diamond sawblades) from the People's Republic of China (China). Commerce is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with Commerce's final results in the 2015–2016 AD administrative review of diamond sawblades from China, and that Commerce is amending the final results.

DATES: Applicable March 6, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Allison Hollander, 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) 482–2805.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On April 20, 2018, Commerce published its final results of the 2015-2016 AD administrative review for diamond sawblades from China.¹ In the Final Results, we determined the dumping margin for both mandatory respondents, Chengdu Huifeng New Material Technology Co., Ltd. (Chengdu Huifeng) and the Jiangsu Fengtai Single Entity,² based entirely on adverse facts available (AFA). Because all the mandatory respondents' rates were based on AFA (and were both the same at 82.05 percent), we applied the mandatory respondents' rate to the companies eligible for a separate rate that were not selected for individual examination, consistent with section 735(c)(5)(B) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) and the "expected method" of the SAA.3

On September 23, 2019, the Court remanded aspects of the *Final Results* to Commerce for further consideration.⁴ The Court remanded Commerce's decision to reject as untimely a supplemental questionnaire response submitted by Chengdu Huifeng and directed Commerce to consider Chengdu Huifeng's response in calculating Chengdu Huifeng's individual dumping margin.⁵ If this

³ See Statement of Administrative Action Accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, H.R. Doc. 103–316, vol. 1 (1994) at 883 (SAA); see also Albemarle Corp. v. United States, 821 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2016).

⁴ See Bosun Tools v. United States, Court No. 18– 00102, Slip Op. 19–125 (September 23, 2019). ⁵ Id. at 14–15.

resulted in a change to Chengdu Huifeng's margin, the Court ordered Commerce to adjust the separate rate respondents' rates accordingly.⁶ In its first remand redetermination, issued in March 2020,7 Commerce accepted Chengdu Huifeng's response and calculated an individual dumping margin of zero percent for Chengdu Huifeng.⁸ Because all the mandatory respondents' rates were either zero, de minimis, or based entirely on AFA, Commerce continued to determine the separate rate pursuant to the "expected method." 9 Specifically, Commerce averaged the zero percent margin for Chengdu Huifeng with the 82.05 percent margin for the Jiangsu Fengtai Single Entity to determine a 41.03 percent rate for the separate rate companies.¹⁰

On July 14, 2020, the Court sustained Commerce's calculation of Chengdu Huifeng's zero percent individual margin but remanded Commerce's determination of the separate rate, finding that Commerce improperly did not consider lower margins from prior administrative reviews in determining whether the separate rate reasonably reflects the separate rate companies' potential dumping behavior.¹¹ In its Second Remand Redetermination, issued in October 2020, Commerce considered the rates from prior reviews, under respectful protest, and determined that the prior rates support continuing to use the expected method to determine the separate rate.¹² Accordingly, Commerce continued to calculate a separate rate of 41.03. The Court sustained the Second Remand Redetermination in full.¹³

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,¹⁴ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,¹⁵ the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(c) of the Act, Commerce must publish a notice of court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Commerce

⁷ See Bosun Tools v. United States, Court No. 18– 00102, Slip Op. 19–125, "Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand," dated March 9, 2020 (First Remand Redetermination).

¹¹ See Bosun Tools v. United States, Court No. 18–00102, Slip Op. 20–97 (July 14, 2020).

¹² See Bosun Tools v. United States, Court No. 18–00102, Slip Op. 20–97, "Final Second Remand Redetermination," dated October 13, 2020 (Second Remand Redetermination).

¹³ See Bosun Tools v. United States, Court No.
18–00102, Slip Op. 21–23 (February 24, 2021).
¹⁴ See Timken Co. v. United States, 893 F.2d 337

(Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*). ¹⁵ See Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v.

United States, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010).

¹ See Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2015– 2016, 83 FR 17527 (April 20, 2018) (Final Results), and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

² The Jiangsu Fengtai Single Entity is comprised of Jiangsu Fengtai Diamond Tool Manufacturer Co., Ltd., Jiangsu Fengtai Diamond Tools Co., Ltd., and Jiangsu Fengtai Sawing Industry Co., Ltd.

⁶ Id.

⁸ Id. at 6.

⁹ Id. at 7–8.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 8.