

The HTSUS subheadings above are provided for convenience and customs purposes only. The written description of the scope of the investigation is dispositive.

### List of Topics Discussed in the Preliminary Decision Memorandum

- I. Summary
- II. Background
- III. Period of Investigation
- IV. Postponement of the Final Determination
- V. Scope Comments
- VI. Scope of the Investigation
- VII. Affiliation and Collapsing
- VIII. Discussion of the Methodology
- IX. Date of Sale
- X. Universe of Sales Examined
- XI. Product Comparisons
- XII. Export Price/Constructed Export Price
- XIII. Normal Value/Constructed Value
- XIV. Currency Conversion
- XV. Recommendation

[FR Doc. 2019-19511 Filed 9-9-19; 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 Interim Panel Decision and Order in the matter of Softwood Lumber from Canada (Secretariat File Number: USA-CDA-2018-1904-03).

**SUMMARY:** On September 4, 2019, the Binational Panel issued its Interim Decision and Order in the matter of Softwood Lumber from Canada. The Binational Panel affirmed in part and remanded in part the Final Determination by the United States International Trade Commission (Commission).

**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 September 4, 2019, the Binational Panel issued its Interim Decision and Order which affirmed in part and remanded in part the Final Determination by United States International Trade Commission. In accordance with NAFTA Article 1904.8, for reasons more fully set forth in within the Analysis section of the Decision (which shall be controlling in the event of conflict), and based upon the evidence in the administrative record, the applicable law, the written submissions of the Parties, and oral argument at the Panel's hearing, the Panel remands the Commission's determinations as follows:

With respect to the Business Cycle and Conditions of Competition, the Panel remands this issue to the Commission and directs the Commission to reconsider the record evidence in relation to the business cycle(s) distinctive to the U.S. lumber industry, and to apply its findings in its analysis of volume, price effects, impact, and causation.

With respect to the use of Post-Petition data, the Panel remands the Commission's decision to reduce the weight it accorded to interim 2017 data and directs the Commission to provide a reasoned determination on whether or not to reduce the weight accorded to interim 2017 data;

The Panel directs the Commission to clarify whether or not it is also reducing the weight accorded to third- and fourth-quarter 2017 data. If, upon reconsideration, the Commission decides to reduce the weight given to post-petition data, the Commission is further directed to clarify what weight, if any, it is giving to post-petition data and the reasons for this determination.

With respect to the Substitutability conclusions, the Panel remands the matter to the Commission, and directs it to reconsider its calculation of substitution elasticity, explaining how it reached its conclusion and demonstrating how that conclusion was applied in the Commission's analysis of volume, price effects, impact, and causation; and demonstrate how, and to what extent, the limitations to substitutability implied in its conclusion that the goods were "at least moderately substitutable" factored into the Commission's analysis of volume, price effects, impact, and causation.

With respect to the Volume analysis, the Panel remands this determination to the Commission and directs the Commission to consider all record evidence to demonstrate how, and to what extent, the limitations to substitutability implied in its conclusion that the goods were "at least moderately substitutable" factored into its conclusion that subject imports experienced significant gains in market share directly at the expense of the domestic industry. The Panel directs the Commission to further reconsider its volume analysis as the Commission determines appropriate.

With respect to the Price Effects analysis, as to the Domestic Capacity aspect of the price suppression analysis, the Panel remands this determination to the Commission and directs the Commission to consider whether to take the more recent Forest Economic Advisors ("FEA") data into account in its domestic capacity analysis, explain its decision, and, if it decides to take the updated FEA data into account, reconsider its price effects analysis as it determines is appropriate.

As to the Different Softwood Species aspect of the price suppression analysis, the Panel remands this determination to the Commission and directs the Commission to reconsider its conclusion that the prices of different species closely track each other to take into consideration that price movements of one species "affect" prices of other species, the existence of a "great difference in price movement" of one species compared to another, and that prices for different species "generally track" each other, as well as any other record evidence, and to determine what effect such reconsideration has on its price suppression analysis.

As to the Cost of Goods Sold ("COGS") and Pricing Trends aspect of the price suppression issue, the Panel remands this determination to the Commission and directs the Commission to reconsider its COGS and price trends analysis to take into account the Commission's finding that subject imports and domestic products are at least moderately substitutable, and determine what effect such reconsideration has on its finding that subject imports prevented price increases which otherwise would have occurred to a significant degree.

With respect to the Questionnaire Responses aspect of the price suppression analysis, the Panel remands this determination to the Commission and directs the Commission to reconsider the record evidence, its conclusion that purchasers confirmed purchasing subject imports rather than

domestic product solely due to their lower prices, and to determine what effect such reconsideration has on its price suppression analysis.

With respect to the Impact issue, the Panel found that the Commission's finding of adverse impact is lawful and supported by substantial evidence in light of its determinations regarding post-petition data, substitutability, volume, price effects, and the business cycle, which have been remanded elsewhere in this decision. If, in any of these remands, the Commission reaches a different finding or conclusion on the particular issue, then the Panel directs the Commission to determine and explain what effect such reconsideration has on its impact analysis.

With respect to the Causation issue, the Panel found that the Commission's finding of causation is lawful and supported by substantial evidence in light of its determinations regarding volume, price effect, and impact. If, after reconsideration, the Commission reaches a different finding or conclusion on any of these issues, then the Panel directs the Commission to determine and explain what effect such reconsideration has on its causation analysis.

The Panel ordered the Commission to submit its redetermination on remand within 90 days from the issuance of the Interim Panel Decision and Order. For the full Interim Panel Decision and Order, please see <https://www.nafta-sec-alena.org/Home/Dispute-Settlement/Decisions-and-Reports>.

Dated: September 5, 2019.

**Paul E. Morris,**

*U.S. Secretary, NAFTA Secretariat.*

[FR Doc. 2019-19533 Filed 9-9-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-GT-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[C-570-046]

#### 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid From the People's Republic of China: Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2018

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

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (Commerce) is rescinding the administrative review of the countervailing duty (CVD) order on 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid (HEDP) from the People's Republic

of China (China) for the period January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.

**DATES:** Applicable September 10, 2019.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Justin Neuman, AD/CVD Operations, Office V, Enforcement and Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1401 Constitution Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0486.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On May 1, 2019, Commerce published in the **Federal Register** a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of the CVD order on HEDP from China for the period January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018.<sup>1</sup> On May 31, 2019, Compass Chemical International LLC (Compass Chemical), a domestic interested party, filed a timely request for review with respect to Shandong Taihe Chemicals Co., Ltd., Shandong Taihe Water Treatment Technologies Co., Ltd., and Henan Qingshuiyuan Technology Co., Ltd., in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), and 19 CFR 351.213(b).<sup>2</sup> Pursuant to this request, and in accordance with section 751(a) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(1)(i), we initiated an administrative review of these companies.<sup>3</sup> On August 26, 2019, Compass Chemical filed a timely withdrawal of request for the administrative review.<sup>4</sup>

##### Rescission of Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if the party that requested the review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested review. As noted above, Compass Chemical, the only party to file a request for review, withdrew its request by the 90-day deadline. Accordingly, we are rescinding the administrative review of the CVD order on HEDP from China for the period January 1, 2018, through December 31, 2018, in its entirety.

<sup>1</sup> See *Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 84 FR 18479 (May 1, 2019).

<sup>2</sup> See Letter from Compass Chemical, "Request for Administrative Review: 1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China," dated May 31, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> See *Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews*, 84 FR 33739 (July 15, 2019).

<sup>4</sup> See Letter from Compass Chemical, "1-Hydroxyethylidene-1, 1-Diphosphonic Acid from the People's Republic of China," dated August 26, 2019.

##### Assessment

Commerce will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to assess CVD duties on all appropriate entries of HEDP from China. CVD duties shall be assessed at rates equal to the cash deposit of estimated CVD duties required at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(c)(1)(i). Commerce intends to issue appropriate assessment instructions to CBP 15 days after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

##### Notification to Importers

This notice serves as a reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of CVD duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in Commerce's presumption that reimbursement of CVD duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled CVD duties.

##### Notification Regarding Administrative Protective Orders

This notice also serves as a reminder to all parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305. Timely written notification of the return/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 which is subject to sanction.

This notice is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.213(d)(4).

Dated: September 4, 2019.

**James Maeder,**

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

[FR Doc. 2019-19507 Filed 9-9-19; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

#### Initiation of Five-Year (Sunset) Review

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

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), the Department of Commerce (Commerce) is