

LIST OF PETITIONS RECEIVED BY EDA FOR CERTIFICATION ELIGIBILITY TO APPLY FOR TRADE ADJUSTMENT ASSISTANCE—
Continued
[4/11/2017 through 4/25/2017]

Firm name	Firm address	Date accepted for investigation	Product(s)
Aurora Circuits, Inc	2250 White Oak Circle, Aurora, IL 60502.	4/19/2017	The firm manufactures printed circuit boards including single sided, double sided and multi-layer which are made of copper, aluminum, fiberglass and other substrates.
Loudspeaker Components, LLC.	7596 U.S. Highway 61 South, Lancaster, WI 53813.	4/12/2017	The firm manufactures speakers and speaker components including speaker cone assemblies (diaphragm), paper-board gasket, dust caps and spiders using manufacturing technologies such as paper making, plastic thermoforming, plastic injection molding, foam cutting and cloth treating sold in the OEM Automotive, aftermarket automotive, professional, multi-media, Hi-Fi, home alarm and musical instrument markets.
Michiana Global Mold, Inc	1702 East 7th Street, Mishawaka, IN 46544.	4/20/2017	The firm manufactures plastic and rubber injection molds.
Metcast Industries, LLC	401 East Avenue B, Salina, KS 67402.	4/24/2017	The firm manufactures ductile and gray iron and other alloys.
The Industrial Controls Company, Inc.	N56 W24842 Corporate Circle, Sussex, WI 53089.	4/25/2017	The firm manufactures electrical control systems including custom control panels, production panels and hazardous location panels using electrical components such as wire, wire harnesses, connectors, controllers, relays, switches and indicators which are housed in cabinets, enclosures and brackets.
Sunflower Electrical Systems, LLC.	8302 Hedge Lane Terrace, Suite H, Shawnee, KS 66227.	4/25/2017	The firm manufactures custom electromechanical wire assemblies and harnesses.

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 for Firms 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.

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.

Miriam Kearse,

Lead Program Analyst.

[FR Doc. 2017-09589 Filed 5-10-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-WH-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-570-904]

Certain Activated Carbon From the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results With Respect to Ningxia Huahui Activated Carbon Company, Ltd.

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

SUMMARY: On April 27, 2017, the Court of International Trade (CIT) issued its final judgment, sustaining the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) remand results pertaining to the third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain activated carbon from the People's Republic of China (PRC) covering the period of review (POR) of April 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010. The Department is notifying the public that the final judgment in this case is not in harmony with the final results of the administrative review, and that the Department is amending the final results with respect to Ningxia Huahui Activated Carbon Company, Ltd. (Huahui).

DATES: *Effective Date:* May 7, 2017.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert Palmer, AD/CVD Operations Office VIII, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-9068.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On October 31, 2011, the Department issued the *AR3 Final Results* in its review of certain activated carbon from the PRC,¹ in which the Department calculated zero and *de minimis* weighted-average dumping margins for the individually-examined respondents.² In the *AR3 Final Results*, the Department determined that averaging the individually-examined respondents' zero and *de minimis* rates to establish separate rates for non-selected exporters would not be reasonably reflective of potential dumping margins during the POR.³ In

¹ See *Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Final Results and Partial Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 76 FR 67142 (October 31, 2011) (*AR3 Final Results*) and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum.

² The individually examined respondents were Jacobi Carbons AB and Calgon Carbon (Tianjin) Co., Ltd.

³ See *AR3 Final Results* and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at 5.

particular, the Department assigned to Huahui the \$0.44/kg dumping margin it had assigned Huahui as an individually-examined respondent in the second administrative review, and assigned to all other separate rate respondents a dumping margin of \$0.28/kg, which was the margin the Department had assigned to separate rate respondents in the second administrative review.⁴

Certain separate rate respondents and their respective U.S. importers⁵ challenged the Department's separate rate determinations in the CIT.⁶ The CIT, in *Albemarle I*, remanded the Department's determination with regard to the separate rates assigned to Shanxi DMD and GHC/BPAC, and ordered the Department to reconsider its assignment of the \$0.28/kg dumping margin to those separate rate respondents.⁷ The CIT reserved any decision regarding whether the \$0.44/kg dumping margin assigned to Huahui was permissible until its review of the Department's remand redetermination.⁸ On remand following *Albemarle I*, the Department, under protest, averaged the zero and *de minimis* margins assigned to the individually-examined respondents in the third administrative review and assigned a dumping margin of zero to the separate rate respondents other than Huahui.⁹ The Department declined to reconsider Huahui's dumping margin on remand, and, therefore, continued to assign the previous rate of \$0.44/kg.¹⁰

Upon review of the Department's First Remand Redetermination, the CIT sustained the Department's assignment of the zero dumping margins to Shanxi DMD and GHC/BPAC, as well as the Department's assignment of a \$0.44/kg dumping margin to Huahui.¹¹ On December 5, 2014, the Department issued amended final results notifying the public that the final judgment in the case, with respect to Shanxi DMD and GHC/BPAC, was not in harmony with the *AR3 Final Results*. Accordingly, the Department revised the weighted-

average dumping margins for Shanxi DMD and GHC/BPAC to zero dollars per kilogram.¹²

Multiple parties appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit). The Federal Circuit, in *Albemarle III*, affirmed the CIT's judgment sustaining the Department's First Remand Redetermination with respect to Shanxi DMD and GHC/BPAC, but reversed the CIT's judgment as to the \$0.44/kg dumping margin assigned to Huahui.¹³ Specifically, with regard to Huahui, the Federal Circuit found that, given Huahui's history of dumping in the immediately preceding review, the Department had substantial evidence to support a determination that averaging the zero and *de minimis* rates assigned to the mandatory respondents may not reasonably reflect Huahui's potential dumping margin during the POR.¹⁴ Nonetheless, although the Federal Circuit held that the Department was entitled to use "other reasonable methods" in assigning a rate to Huahui, the Federal Circuit found that the chosen method of carrying forward Huahui's data from the second administrative review was unreasonable.¹⁵ In particular, citing the statute's preference for contemporaneity in periodic administrative reviews, the Federal Circuit held that "Commerce could not on this record utilize data from the previous review," and, "having declined to collect additional information, was required to follow the 'expected method' of utilizing the *de minimis* margins of the individually examined respondents from the contemporaneous period."¹⁶ The Federal Circuit remanded the case to the CIT to issue appropriate instructions to the Department regarding the dumping margin to be assigned to Huahui.¹⁷

The CIT, in turn, remanded the issue to the Department with the instruction to "redetermine a margin for Huahui in accordance with the holding of the Court of Appeals in *Albemarle III*."¹⁸ In its Second Remand Redetermination,

the Department averaged the zero and *de minimis* rates calculated for the individually-examined respondents in the third administrative review and assigned the resulting zero dumping margin to Huahui.¹⁹ On April 27, 2017, the CIT sustained the Second Remand Redetermination and entered judgment accordingly.²⁰ The CIT's judgment in *Albemarle IV* constitutes a final decision that is not in harmony with the Department's *AR3 Final Results* and the *Amended AR3 Final Results*.

Timken Notice

In its decision in *Timken*,²¹ as clarified by *Diamond Sawblades*,²² the Federal Circuit held that, pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department must publish a notice of a court decision that is not "in harmony" with a Department determination and must suspend liquidation of entries pending a "conclusive" court decision.

This notice is published in fulfillment of the publication requirement of *Timken*. Accordingly, the Department will continue the suspension of liquidation of the subject merchandise at issue in the Second Remand Redetermination and *Albemarle IV* pending expiration of the period to appeal or, if appealed, a final and conclusive court decision.

Amended Final Results

Because there is now a final court decision, the Department amends the *AR3 Final Results* with respect to Huahui. Based on the Second Remand Redetermination, as affirmed by the Court in *Albemarle IV*, the revised weighted-average dumping margin for Huahui for the period April 1, 2009, through March 31, 2010, is zero.

In the event that the CIT's ruling is not appealed or, if appealed, is upheld by a final and conclusive court decision, the Department will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to assess antidumping duties on unliquidated entries of subject merchandise based on the revised dumping margin listed above.

¹⁹ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, *Albemarle Corp. et al. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 11-00451, Slip Op. 16-84 (CIT September 7, 2016) (Second Remand Redetermination).

²⁰ See *Albemarle Corp. et al. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 11-00451, Slip Op. 17-51 (CIT April 27, 2017) (*Albemarle IV*).

²¹ See *Timken Co. v. United States*, 893 F.2d 337, 341 (Fed. Cir. 1990) (*Timken*).

²² See *Diamond Sawblades Mfrs. Coalition v. United States*, 626 F.3d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2010) (*Diamond Sawblades*).

⁴ *Id.* at 67145 and accompanying Issues and Decision Memorandum at 2-7.

⁵ Plaintiffs were Huahui and its affiliated U.S. importer Albemarle Corporation; Shanxi DMD Corporation (Shanxi DMD); and Ningxia Guanghua Cherishmet Activated Carbon Company and Beijing Pacific Activated Carbon Products Company, Ltd. (GHC/BPAC) and their affiliated U.S. importer Cherishmet Inc.

⁶ *Albemarle Corp. v. United States*, 931 F. Supp. 2d 1280 (CIT 2013) (*Albemarle I*).

⁷ *Id.* at 1296-97.

⁸ *Id.* at 1293.

⁹ See Final Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand, *Albemarle Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Ct. No. 11-00451 at 13 (January 9, 2014) (First Remand Redetermination).

¹⁰ *Id.* at 22.

¹¹ *Albemarle Corp. v. United States*, 27 F. Supp. 3d 1336, 1352 (CIT 2014) (*Albemarle II*).

¹² *Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With Final Results of Administrative Review and Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2009-2010*, 79 FR 72165 (December 5, 2014) (*Amended AR3 Final Results*).

¹³ *Albemarle Corp. & Subsidiaries v. United States*, 821 F.3d 1345 (Fed. Cir. 2016) (*Albemarle III*).

¹⁴ *Id.* at 1355.

¹⁵ *Id.* at 1355-56.

¹⁶ *Id.* at 1359.

¹⁷ *Id.*

¹⁸ See *Albemarle Corp. v. United States*, Consol. Court No. 11-00451, Slip Op. 16-84 (CIT September 7, 2016) at 5-6.

Cash Deposit Requirements

Because there have been subsequent administrative reviews for Huahui, the cash deposit rate for Huahui will remain the rate established in the recently-completed *AR8 Final Results*, which is \$1.36/kg.²³

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: May 5, 2017.

Gary Taverman,

Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary for Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Operations.

[FR Doc. 2017-09578 Filed 5-10-17; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

National Institute of Standards and Technology

[Docket No.: 170331340-7340-01]

National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence (NCCoE) Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Building Block

AGENCY: National Institute of Standards and Technology, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) invites organizations to provide products and technical expertise to support and demonstrate security platforms for the Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Building Block. This notice is the initial step for the National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence (NCCoE) in collaborating with technology companies to address cybersecurity challenges identified under the Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Building Block. Participation in the building block is open to all interested organizations.

DATES: Interested parties must contact NIST to request a letter of interest template to be completed and submitted to NIST. Letters of interest will be accepted on a first come, first served basis. Collaborative activities will commence as soon as enough completed and signed letters of interest have been returned to address all the necessary components and capabilities, but no earlier than June 12, 2017. When the

building block has been completed, NIST will post a notice on the NCCoE Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Web site at https://nccoe.nist.gov/projects/building_blocks/trusted_geolocation_in_the_cloud announcing the completion of the building block and informing the public that it will no longer accept letters of interest for this building block.

ADDRESSES: The NCCoE is located at 9700 Great Seneca Highway, Rockville, MD 20850. Letters of interest must be submitted to trusted-cloud-nccoe@nist.gov or via hardcopy to National Institute of Standards and Technology, 100 Bureau Drive Mail Stop 2002 Gaithersburg, MD 20899. Organizations whose letters of interest are accepted in accordance with the process set forth in the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this notice will be asked to sign a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) with NIST. A CRADA template can be found at: <https://nccoe.nist.gov/library/nccoe-consortium-crada-example>.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Mike Bartock and Murugiah Souppaya via email to trusted-cloud-nccoe@nist.gov; by telephone 301-975-5358; or by mail to National Institute of Standards and Technology, NCCoE, 100 Bureau Drive Mail Stop 2002 Gaithersburg, MD 20899. Additional details about the Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Building Block are available at: https://nccoe.nist.gov/projects/building_blocks/trusted_geolocation_in_the_cloud.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background: The NCCoE, part of NIST, is a public-private collaboration for accelerating the widespread adoption of integrated cybersecurity tools and technologies. The NCCoE brings together experts from industry, government, and academia under one roof to develop practical, interoperable cybersecurity approaches that address the real-world needs of complex Information Technology (IT) systems. By accelerating dissemination and use of these integrated tools and technologies for protecting IT assets, the NCCoE will enhance trust in U.S. IT communications, data, and storage systems; reduce risk for companies and individuals using IT systems; and encourage development of innovative, job-creating cybersecurity products and services.

Process: NIST is soliciting responses from all sources of relevant security capabilities (see below) to enter into a Cooperative Research and Development Agreement (CRADA) to provide products and technical expertise to support and demonstrate security

platforms for the Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Building Block. The full building block can be viewed at: https://nccoe.nist.gov/projects/building_blocks/trusted_geolocation_in_the_cloud.

Interested parties should contact NIST using the information provided in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this notice. NIST will then provide each interested party with a letter of interest template, which the party must complete, certify that it is accurate, and submit to NIST. NIST will contact interested parties if there are questions regarding the responsiveness of the letters of interest to the building block objective or requirements identified below. NIST will select participants who have submitted complete letters of interest on a first come, first served basis within each category of product components or capabilities listed below up to the number of participants in each category necessary to carry out this building block. However, there may be continuing opportunity to participate even after initial activity commences. Selected participants will be required to enter into a consortium CRADA with NIST (for reference, see **ADDRESSES** section above). NIST published a notice in the **Federal Register** on October 19, 2012 (77 FR 64314), inviting U.S. companies to enter into National Cybersecurity Excellence Partnerships (NCEPs) in furtherance of the NCCoE. For this demonstration project, NCEP partners will not be given priority for participation.

Building Block Objective: The building block provides details about the implementation of trusted resource pools to aggregate trusted systems and segregate them from untrusted resources, which results in the separation of higher-value, more sensitive workloads from commodity application and data workloads. A detailed description of the Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Building Block is available at: https://nccoe.nist.gov/projects/building_blocks/trusted_geolocation_in_the_cloud.

Requirements: Each responding organization's letter of interest should identify which security platform component(s) or capability(ies) it is offering. Letters of interest should not include company proprietary information, and all components and capabilities must be commercially available. Components are listed in section 5 of the Trusted Geolocation in the Cloud Building Block (for reference, please see the link in the **PROCESS** section above) and include, but are not limited to:

²³ See *Certain Activated Carbon from the People's Republic of China: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2014-2015*, 81 FR 62088, 62089 (September 8, 2016) (*AR8 Final Results*).