SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration


AGENCY: United States Section, NAFTA Secretariat, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.


SUMMARY: On April 13, 2017, the Binational Panel issued its Memorandum Opinion and Order in the matter of Supercalendered Paper from Canada: Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty Determination (Final Determination). The Binational Panel affirmed in part and remanded in part the Final Determination by the United States Department of Commerce (Commerce) and copies of the NAFTA Panel Decision are available from the United States Section of the NAFTA Secretariat.

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-ala.org/Home/Texts-of-the-Agreement/Rules-of-Procedural-Article-1904.

Panel Decision: On April 13, 2017, the Binational Panel issued its Memorandum Opinion and Order which affirmed in part and remanded in part the Final Determination by Commerce. The Binational Panel concluded and ordered that Commerce’s Final Determination is remanded for further consideration consistent with the Panel’s decision with respect to (1) the use of Commerce’s “concurrent subsidies” methodology to analyze the provision of “hot idle” funding to Port Hawkesbury Paper LLP (PHP) in a transaction between private parties; (2) Commerce’s conclusion that the Government of Nova Scotia entrusted and directed Nova Scotia Power, Inc. to make a financial contribution by providing electricity; (3) Commerce’s conclusion that Nova Scotia Power, Inc. provided electricity for less than adequate remuneration, addressing both its conclusion that a Tier 1 benchmark was not available and its calculation of a Tier 3 benchmark; (4) the use of Commerce’s “concurrent subsidies methodology” with respect to granting of Forestry Infrastructure monies to New Page Port Hawkesbury (NPPH) prior to its acquisition by Pacific West Commercial Corporation (PWCC); (5) Commerce’s statement that the administrative record contains no evidence of a hostile takeover of Fibrek by Resolute; (6) Commerce’s failure to examine whether the grants to Resolute under the Northern Industrial Electricity Rate and Forestry Sector Prosperity Funds programs were tied to the production of a particular product or to the production of an input product; and (7) Commerce’s use of the same non-recurring grant as the source for Adverse Facts Available for both recurring and non-recurring grants.

The Binational Panel ordered that to the extent not rendered moot by Commerce’s explanation on remand as to why a Tier 1 benchmark for measuring the adequacy of remuneration of Port Hawkesbury’s electricity was not available, Commerce’s October 21, 2016 motion for a voluntary remand to consider whether Commerce should include a separate component for return on equity in its Tier 3 benchmark for measuring the adequacy of remuneration of Port Hawkesbury’s electricity is granted, and the calculation of the benchmark for such purchases is hereby remanded. The Binational Panel further ordered that to the extent Commerce’s Final Determination is remanded for further consideration Commerce is directed to conduct a redetermination of suitability of the Tier 3 benchmark for measuring the adequacy of remuneration of Port Hawkesbury’s electricity. The Binational Panel ordered that to the extent that the Bureau of Industry and Security is entitled to make a financial contribution by providing electricity to the new entity created by the acquisition of the paper mill by the government of Nova Scotia, the Bureau of Industry and Security is directed to conduct a redetermination of suitability of the Tier 3 benchmark for measuring the adequacy of remuneration of Port Hawkesbury’s electricity. The Binational Panel advised Commerce and the Bureau of Industry and Security that the Bureau of Industry and Security is entitled to make a financial contribution by providing electricity to the new entity created by the acquisition of the paper mill by the government of Nova Scotia.
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Antidumping Suspension Agreement on Sugar From Mexico: Rescission of 2014–2015 and 2015–2016 Administrative Reviews
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SUMMARY: On May 1, 2017, the Department notified the producers/exporters that were signatories to the Agreement Suspending the Antidumping Duty Investigation on sugar from Mexico (the AD Agreement) of its intent to terminate the AD Agreement unless a new agreement was reached on or before June 5, 2017. The Department subsequently modified its notice of intent to terminate the AD Agreement, stating its continued intent to terminate the AD Agreement unless an amended agreement was reached on or before June 6, 2017. Because the Department intends to terminate the AD Agreement, or, in the alternative, amend the AD Agreement prior to the expiration of the termination period, the two ongoing administrative reviews of the original AD Agreement are now moot, and the Department is rescinding both administrative reviews.


SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

Investigation and Issuance of the AD Agreement

On April 17, 2014, the Department initiated an antidumping duty investigation under section 732 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), to determine whether imports of sugar from Mexico are being, or are likely to be, sold in the United States at less than...