

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

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

⁶ *Id.*

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).

⁸ *Id.* at 6.

⁹ *Id.* at 7-8.

¹⁰ *Id.* at 8.

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.

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.

determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a “conclusive” court decision. The Court’s February 24, 2021 judgment constitutes a final decision of that court that is not in harmony with Commerce’s *Final Results*. This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirements of *Timken*. Accordingly, Commerce will continue suspension of liquidation of subject merchandise pending expiration of the period of appeal or, if appealed, pending a final and conclusive court decision.

Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court decision, Commerce is amending the *Final Results* with respect to Chengdu Huifeng and the separate rate companies that are party to the litigation. The revised AD margins for the period November 1, 2015, through October 31, 2016, are as follows:¹⁶

Exporter	Weighted-average dumping margin (percent)
Chengdu Huifeng New Technology Co., Ltd	0.00
Bosun Tools Co., Ltd	41.03
Danyang NYCL Tools Manufacturing Co., Ltd	41.03
Danyang Weiwang Tools Manufacturing Co., Ltd	41.03
Guilin Tebon Superhard Material Co., Ltd	41.03
Hangzhou Deer King Industrial and Trading Co., Ltd	41.03
Jiangsu Youhe Tool Manufacturer Co., Ltd	41.03
Quanzhou Zhongzhi Diamond Tool Co., Ltd	41.03
Rizhao Hein Saw Co., Ltd	41.03
Zhejiang Wanli Tools Group Co., Ltd	41.03

Amended Cash Deposit Rates

Because all of the companies have been subject to a subsequent administrative review which established revised cash deposit rates,¹⁷ Commerce will not issue revised cash deposit instructions to U.S. Customs and Border Protection.

Notification to Interested Parties

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 516A(e)(1), 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 15, 2021.

Christian Marsh,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Enforcement and Compliance.

[FR Doc. 2021-05760 Filed 3-18-21; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-122, C-570-123]

Certain Corrosion Inhibitors From the People’s Republic of China: Antidumping Duty and Countervailing Duty Orders

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

SUMMARY: Based on affirmative final determinations by the Department of Commerce (Commerce) and International Trade Commission (ITC), Commerce is issuing antidumping duty (AD) and countervailing duty (CVD) orders on certain corrosion inhibitors (corrosion inhibitors) from the People’s Republic of China (China).

DATES: Applicable March 19, 2021.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Andre Gziryran (AD), Theodore Pearson (CVD), or Nicholas Czajkowski (CVD), 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) 482-2201, (202) 482-2631, or (202) 482-1395, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

In accordance with sections 705(d) and 735(d) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), on January 29, 2021, Commerce published its affirmative final determination that countervailable subsidies are being provided to producers and exporters of corrosion inhibitors from China and its affirmative final determination in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation of corrosion inhibitors from China.¹ On March 12, 2021, pursuant to sections 705(d) and 735(d) of the Act, the ITC notified Commerce of its final affirmative determinations that an industry in the United States is materially injured by

reason of subsidized imports and LTFV imports of corrosion inhibitors from China, within the meaning of sections 705(b)(1)(A)(i) and 735(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act.²

Scope of the Orders

The products covered by these orders are corrosion inhibitors from China. For a full description of the scope of these orders, *see* Appendix I.

AD Order

As stated above, on March 12, 2021, in accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, the ITC notified Commerce of its final determination that an industry in the United States is materially injured within the meaning of section 735(b)(1)(A)(i) of the Act by reason of imports of corrosion inhibitors from China that are sold in the United States at LTFV.³ Therefore, in accordance with section 735(c)(2) of the Act, we are issuing this AD order. Because the ITC determined that imports of corrosion inhibitors from China are materially injuring a U.S. industry, unliquidated entries of such merchandise from China entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption are subject to the assessment of antidumping duties.

Therefore, in accordance with sections 736(a)(1) of the Act, Commerce will direct U.S. Customs and Border Patrol (CBP) to assess, upon further instruction by Commerce, antidumping duties equal to the amount by which the normal value of the merchandise exceeds the export price (or constructed export price) of the merchandise and countervailing duties for all relevant entries of corrosion inhibitors from China. Antidumping duties will be assessed on unliquidated entries of corrosion inhibitors from China entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after September 10, 2020, the date of publication of the *AD Preliminary Determination*, but will not include entries occurring after the expiration of the provisional measures period and before publication of the ITC’s final injury determination, as further described below.⁴

² See ITC’s Letter, “Notification of ITC Final Determinations,” dated March 12, 2021 (ITC Notification Letter).

³ *Id.*

⁴ See *Certain Corrosion Inhibitors from the People’s Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value, Postponement of Final Determination, and Extension of Provisional Measures*, 85 FR 55825 (September 10, 2020) (*AD Preliminary Determination*), and accompanying Preliminary Decision Memorandum (PDM).

¹⁶ See Second Remand Redetermination at 2–3.

¹⁷ See *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2016–2017*, 83 FR 64331 (December 14, 2018); *Diamond Sawblades and Parts Thereof from the People’s Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2017–2018*, 85 FR 71308 (November 9, 2020).

¹ See *Certain Corrosion Inhibitors from the People’s Republic of China: Final Affirmative Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 86 FR 7532 (January 29, 2021); see also *Certain Corrosion Inhibitors from the People’s Republic of China: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination*, 86 FR 7537 (January 29, 2021) (*CVD Final Determination*).