

# Trade Law Update

February 2025



## HIGHLIGHTS FROM FEBRUARY

### [Petition Summary: Certain Chassis Subassemblies Thereof from Mexico, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam](#)

On February 26, 2025, the U.S. Chassis Manufacturers Coalition filed a petition for the imposition of antidumping and countervailing duties on U.S. imports of certain chassis and subassemblies thereof from Mexico, Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

### [Petition Summary: Methylene Diphenyl Diisocyanate from the People's Republic of China](#)

On February 12, 2025, the *Ad Hoc* MDI Fair Trade Coalition (“Coalition” or “Petitioner”), filed a petition for the imposition of antidumping duties on U.S. imports of Methylene Diphenyl Diisocyanate (“MDI”) from the People's Republic of China (“China”).

### [100 Days of Trade](#)

In the six weeks since President Trump began his second term, the administration has issued dozens of executive orders and other actions that are reshaping trade policies across various sectors. To help you stay informed, Husch Blackwell's International Trade & Supply Chain team has launched a dedicated series tracking these new actions and their implications for your business.

### [U.S. Customs and Border Protection Bulletins](#)

February CBP issued a notice of proposed rulemaking in the [February 5, 2025 Customs Bulletin](#) proposing amendments to the CBP regulations pertaining to the administrative exemption for certain low-value shipments not exceeding \$800.

CBP also issued notice in the [February 19, 2025 Customs Bulletin](#) that updating the quarterly underpayment and overpayment rates.

*See Page 3 for additional information.*

### IN THIS ISSUE:

- Petition Summaries
- 100 Days of Trade
- U.S. Department of Commerce Decisions
- U.S. International Trade Commission
- U.S. Customs and Border Protection
- Court of International Trade

### [U.S. Customs and Border Protection Cargo Systems Messaging \(CSMS\)](#)

CBP issued [CSMS # 64235342](#) providing guidance for the additional duties for imports that are the products of China.

CBP issued [CSMS #63988468](#) identifying 9903.01.20 as the applicable HTS number associated with the 10% additional IEEPA tariffs on products from China and Hong Kong.

*See Page 3 for additional information.*

## U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE DECISIONS

### Investigations

- Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products From Brazil: On February 10, 2025, Commerce issued its Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty [Determination](#), and Alignment of Final Determination With Final Antidumping Duty Determination.
- Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products From Canada: On February 10, 2025, Commerce issued its Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty [Determination](#) and Alignment of Final Determination With Final Antidumping Duty Determination.
- Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products From Mexico: On February 10, 2025, Commerce issued its Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty [Determination](#), and Alignment of Final Determination With Final Antidumping Duty Determination.
- Certain Corrosion-Resistant Steel Products From the Socialist Republic of Vietnam: On February 10, 2025, Commerce issued its Preliminary Affirmative Countervailing Duty [Determination](#), and Alignment of Final Determination With Antidumping Duty Determination.
- Raw Honey From Brazil: On February 10, 2025, Commerce issued its Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final Determination of Antidumping Duty Investigation; Notice of Amended Final [Determination](#); Notice of Amended Antidumping Duty Order.
- Temporary Steel Fencing From the People's Republic of China: On February 11, 2025, Commerce issued its [Initiation](#) of Countervailing Duty Investigation.
- Temporary Steel Fencing From the People's Republic of China: On February 11, 2025, Commerce issued its [Initiation](#) of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation.
- Utility Scale Wind Towers From Spain: On February 11, 2025, Commerce issued its Notice of Court Decision Not in Harmony With the Final [Determination](#) of Less-Than-Fair-Value Investigation; Notice of Amended Final Determination; and Notice of Amended Antidumping Duty Order.
- Melamine From India: On February 12, 2025, Commerce issued its Final Affirmative Countervailing Duty [Determination](#) and Critical Circumstances Determination.
- Melamine From India: On February 12, 2025, Commerce issued its Final Affirmative [Determination](#) of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Affirmative Determination of Critical Circumstances, In Part.
- Certain Low Speed Personal Transportation Vehicles From the People's Republic of China: On February 19, 2025, Commerce issued its Amended Preliminary [Determination](#) of Countervailing Duty Investigation.
- Certain Tungsten Shot From the People's Republic of China: On February 19, 2025, Commerce issued its Preliminary Affirmative [Determination](#) of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination and Extension of Provisional Measures.
- Chlorinated Isocyanurates From Spain: On February 4, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2022–2023.
- Low Melt Polyester Staple Fiber From the Republic of Korea: On February 7, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2022–2023.
- Glycine From Japan: On February 11, 2025, Commerce issued its Notice of Amended Final [Results](#) of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review Pursuant to Settlement; 2018– 2020.
- Chlorinated Isocyanurates From People's Republic of China: On February 18, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2022–2023.
- Carbon and Alloy Steel Cut-to-Length Plate From the Republic of Korea: On February 21, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2022–2023.
- Oil Country Tubular Goods From the Republic of Korea: On February 21, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2022.
- Prestressed Concrete Steel Wire Strand From Malaysia: On February 21, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Partial Rescission; 2022– 2023.
- Stainless Steel Flanges From India: On February 25, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review; 2022

### Changed Circumstances Reviews

- Certain Softwood Lumber Products From Canada: On February 25, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Countervailing Duty Changed Circumstances Review

### Sunset Reviews

- Mattresses From the People's Republic of China: On February 6, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Expedited Sunset Review of Antidumping Duty Order.
- Vertical Metal File Cabinets From the People's Republic of China: On February 24, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of the Expedited First Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order.
- Alloy and Certain Carbon Steel Threaded Rod From the People's Republic of China: On February 27, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of the Expedited First Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order.
- Certain Steel Nails From the People's Republic of China: On February 27, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of the Expedited Sunset Review of the Antidumping Duty Order

### Scope Ruling

- None.

### Circumvention

- None.

### Administrative Reviews

- Thermal Paper From the Republic of Korea: On February 3, 2025, Commerce issued its Final [Results](#) of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; 2022– 2023.

## International Trade Commission

### Investigations

- Sol Gel Alumina-Based Ceramic Abrasive Grains From China: On February 3, 2025, the ITC issued its affirmative [determination](#) of less-than-fair-value investigations.
- Active Anode Material From China: On February 7, 2025, the ITC issued its affirmative [determination](#) of less-than-fair-value investigations.
- Slag Pots From China (Preliminary): On February 21, 2025, the ITC issued its affirmative [determination](#) of less-than-fair-value investigations.
- Glass Wine Bottles From China and Mexico (Final): On February 24, 2025, the ITC issued its negative [determination](#) of less-than-fair-value investigations.

### Sunset Review

- Sodium Nitrite From China and Germany: On February 5, 2025, the ITC issued its [determination](#) to continue the antidumping and countervailing duty orders as revocation would lead to the recurrence or continuation of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.
- Persulfates From China (Fifth Review): On February 13, 2025, the ITC issued its [determination](#) to continue the antidumping order as revocation would lead to the recurrence or continuation of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.
- Laminated Woven Sacks From China (Third Review): On February 20, 2025, the ITC issued its [determination](#) to continue the antidumping and countervailing duty orders as revocation would lead to the recurrence or continuation of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.
- Certain Stilbenic Optical Brightening Agents From China and Taiwan (Second Review): On February 28, 2025, the ITC issued its [determination](#) to continue the antidumping duty orders as revocation would lead to the recurrence or continuation of material injury within a reasonably foreseeable time.

## U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION

### [EAPA Conso. Case No. 8112: TriMar Ribbons Inc. and Ribest Ribbons & Bows USA Inc.](#)

On February 3, 2025, CBP issued the notice of initiation of investigation and implemented interim measures for EAPA Cons. Case 8112 filed by Berwick Offray LLC against U.S. importer TriMar Ribbons Inc. (TriMar) for evasion of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on narrow woven ribbons with woven selvage (woven ribbon) from China (A-570-952 and C-570-953). Specifically, the allegations suggested that TriMar imported woven ribbons from China into the United States via transshipment through India and failed to declare the correct country of origin at the time of entry. For another importer, Ribest Ribbons & Bows USA, Inc. (Ribest), CBP has not imposed interim measures but rather is issuing Ribest a formal notice of investigation.

### [EAPA Case No. 8042: Allied Food Products Inc.](#)

On February 20, 2025, CBP issued the notice of investigation and interim measures as to evasion for EAPA case 8042 based on an allegation filed by CP Kelco U.S., Inc. against U.S. importer Allied Food Products, Inc. (“Allied Food”) for evasion of antidumping order A-570-985 on xanthan gum from China. Specifically, record evidence shows that Allied Food entered Chinese-origin xanthan gum into the United States that was transshipped through India. CBP has determined there is reasonable suspicion of evasion of antidumping duties by Allied Food and, therefore, CBP issued a formal notice of investigation as to evasion and has taken enforcement actions.

### [EAPA Cons. Case No. 7890: Various Importers: Allied Food Products Inc.](#)

On February 24, 2025, CBP issued the notice of determination as to evasion for EAPA case 7890 filed by the U.S. OCTG Manufacturers Association, against U.S. importers Amek Aluminum & Stainless, Inc.; Centric Pipe LLC; Copley International Group Co Ltd; Energy Pipe & Equipment Rentals LLC; Kana Energy Services Inc.; LE Commodities, LLC; Lixin Energy Group (HK) Co., Limited; Longfellow Energy, LP; Trek Metals Inc.; and TSPGA LLC, for evasion of antidumping and countervailing orders A-570-943 and C-570-944 on oil country tubular goods from China. Specifically, evidence on the record indicates that the importers entered Chinese-origin oil country tubular goods that were transshipped through Thailand. As such, CBP has determined that there is substantial evidence of evasion of antidumping and countervailing duties by the importers and, therefore, issued a formal notice of determination as to evasion and has taken enforcement actions.

## U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION BULLETIN

CBP issued a notice of proposed rulemaking in the [February 5, 2025 Customs Bulletin](#) proposing amendments to the CBP regulations pertaining to the administrative exemption for certain low-value shipments not exceeding \$800. Specifically, CBP proposes to make merchandise that is subject to specified trade or national security actions ineligible for this administrative exemption and to require that certain shipments claiming this exemption provide the 10-digit HTSUS classification of the merchandise. Comments must be received by March 24, 2025.

CBP issued notice in the [February 19, 2025 Customs Bulletin](#) that he quarterly Internal Revenue Service interest rates used to calculate interest on over-due accounts (underpayments) and refunds (overpayments) of customs duties will decrease from the previous quarter to be 7 % for underpayments and 6% for overpayments.

## U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION CARGO SYSTEMS MESSAGING (CSMS)

CBP issued [CSMS # 64235342](#) providing instructions for guidance for the additional duties for imports that are the products of China. CBP will reject entry summaries that are not in compliance with the requirements of the Executive Order imposing additional duties for imports that are the products of China, including but not limited to, entry summaries filed without the required additional duties. If an entry summary is rejected, CBP will require a resubmission within two business days of the rejection, per existing policy. If the rejected entry summary is not resubmitted timely with payment, the importer of record may be subject to liquidated damages. Moreover, for entry summary lines that include multiple HTS numbers, CBP requires that the duty be appropriately associated to the correct HTS.

CBP issued [CSMS #63988468](#) identifying 9903.01.20 as the applicable HTS number associated with the 10% additional IEEPA tariffs on products of China and Hong Kong.

## COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE

### Summary of Decisions

#### [Slip Op. 25-14: Your Standing Int'l, Inc. v. United States](#)

The Court sustained Commerce's decision to use San Shing Fastech Corporation's ("San Shing") financial statements to calculate the Plaintiff's, a mandatory respondent, constructed value profit and indirect selling expenses in the administrative review of the AD duty order on certain steel nails from Taiwan. Plaintiff challenged the use of San Shing's financials, arguing that they were inappropriate because they did not reflect sales in Taiwan's home market and because San Shing did not share a similar customer base with the Plaintiff. The Court rejected both claims, finding that Commerce's reliance on San Shing's financials was supported by substantial evidence. The Court explained that neither the statute nor the regulations require Commerce to use home market sales, and that San Shing's revenue was not predominantly derived from U.S. sales. As for the customer base argument, the Court declined to consider it because Plaintiff had not previously raised the argument before Commerce, thus failing to exhaust its administrative remedies.

#### [Slip Op. 25-15: PT. Zinus Glob. Indonesia v. United States](#)

The Court sustained Commerce's second final results of redetermination in the antidumping investigation of mattresses from Indonesia. The Petitioners argued that Commerce's decision to exclude Zinus Global Indonesia's, and its affiliates, (collectively, "Zinus") in-transit mattresses from the quarterly ratio calculation was unlawful and unsupported by substantial evidence. The Court, however, rejected this argument, finding that Commerce's methodology was based on record evidence and provided a reasonable explanation for any minor discrepancies. Specifically, the Court pointed to Commerce's conclusion that Zinus U.S. had a sufficient inventory of Indonesian model number mattresses to meet its sales during the period of investigation, and thus did not need to account for the in-transit mattresses. The Court also upheld Commerce's decision to exclude Zinus Korea's selling expenses from the normal value calculation, noting that Commerce reasonably determined that Zinus Korea, as the parent company, was not involved in the basic selling functions—such as providing training services, technical support, inventory management, and logistical services—that were carried out by Zinus Indonesia and Zinus U.S.

#### [Slip Op. 25-16: Jiangsu Senmao Bambo & Wood Indus. Co. v. United States](#)

The Court sustained in part and remanded in part Commerce's final results of redetermination in an antidumping review of multilayered wood flooring from China. Plaintiff and Plaintiff-Intervenor argued that Commerce's decision to select Brazil as the primary surrogate country, while rejecting or adjusting Brazilian data for key inputs and using Malaysian data for oak log inputs, was not in accordance with the law or supported by substantial evidence. The Court rejected this argument, finding that Commerce properly considered the relevant factors, fulfilled its statutory obligation to use the "best available information," and cited record evidence to support its conclusions. However, the Court remanded the final results, finding that Commerce's use of Brazilian plywood import data, which contained objectively incorrect information, was problematic. Instead of reopening the record to obtain accurate data, Commerce chose to delete one month of import data, causing a distortion that inflated the Brazilian plywood surrogate value by 453%, raising concerns about the accuracy and fairness of the outcome.

#### [Slip Op. 25-17 & 25-18 Consol.: Asia Wheel Co. v. United States](#)

In two related decisions the Court held that Commerce properly included plaintiff Asia Wheel's trailer wheels within the scope of the antidumping and countervailing duty orders on steel trailer wheels from China. At issue was whether Asia Wheel's trailer wheels comprising of Chinese origin rims and Thai discs were within scope. The Court specifically found that

Commerce did not illegally expand the scope as the agency had indicated in the original investigation that it would address this concerns associated with mixed-origin or third country further processed wheels in a scope ruling. The Court analyzed Commerce's substantial transformation analysis and found that it had fully supported its decisions and more importantly that the scope of the Orders specifically includes "rims, discs, and wheels that have been further processed in a third country, including, but not limited to, the painting of wheels from China and the welding and painting of rims and discs from China to form a steel wheel, or any other processing that would not otherwise remove the merchandise from the scope of the Orders if performed in China." The Court focused on the order in which the limiting language appears in the scope and that the phrase "rims and discs from China" comes after the phrase "including, but not limited to," thereby indicating that these are two different examples and that the scope language does not unambiguously exclude mixed-origin components from the scope. Next, turning to Commerce's substantial transformation test, the Court found that Commerce properly relied on the five-factor test established by the Federal Circuit in *Bell Supply v. U.S.* The Court found that Commerce had considered whether the production that occurs in China was sufficient to create components for an "already-designed wheel" and this was in line with the language of the scope. The Court was clear that "some ambiguity in scope language does not mean that notice is inadequate as to products requiring substantial transformation to determine country of origin." In the Court's opinion Commerce has specifically left open the question of what "other types of third-country processing would not remove merchandise from the scope" such that its scope ruling was supported by substantial evidence and in accordance with law.

#### [Slip Op. 25-19: Nanjing Kaylang Co. v. United States](#)

The Court denied Plaintiff's challenge of Commerce's scope ruling and upheld the decision that Plaintiff's products were subject to the 2020 antidumping and countervailing orders on wooden cabinets and vanities and components from China ("Orders"). The Plaintiff argued that the scope of the Order is limited to articles made of wood, and therefore, the only issue should be whether "non-wood" products fall within the scope of the Orders. Since Commerce had determined that phragmite is not wood, the Plaintiff contended that Commerce improperly expanded the term "composite board" in the scope of the Orders to include composite boards not made of wood. However, siding with Commerce, the Court noted that the scope of the Orders includes cabinets and vanities made from "engineered wood products (including those made from wood particles, fibers, or other wooden materials such as plywood, strand board, block board, particle board, or fiberboard), or bamboo," which could reasonably be interpreted to cover the Plaintiff's phragmite products. The court affirmed Commerce's scope ruling.

#### [Slip Op. 25-20: Precision Components, Inc. v. United States](#)

The Court on February 25, 2025, affirmed Commerce's scope ruling that low-carbon steel blanks were within the scope of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings from China. The Court found that Commerce, in conducting the scope ruling inquiry, properly concluded Precision's request were identical to a prior scope ruling. In 2020, Precision had requested a scope ruling on "cups, cones and rollers that are silver metallic in color and green-machined, but not heat-treated, at the time of importation" which Commerce had found were within scope as it had not provided sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the imported merchandise had an end-use other than to manufacture tapered roller bearings. At issue in this appeal was Precision's 2023 scope ruling calling the products "low carbon steel blanks" where the imported goods were claimed to be made from "nonstandard steel" and then sold in the United States to U.S. customers who add substantial value with "significant further processing." After initiating the scope ruling, Commerce analyzed the record and compared the 2020 scope decision record to the 2023 scope ruling request and found the products covered therein to be "indistinguishable." The Court upheld Commerce's scope ruling on the grounds that the 2023 ruling request covered unfinished bearing parts which are part of the scope of the order. The Court also sustained Commerce's reliance on the prior 2020 scope ruling as a basis for its final decision as it would not lead to two inconsistent conclusions.

## [Slip Op. 25-21: Grupo Simec S.A.B. de C.V. v. United States](#)

The Court sustained Commerce’s remand determination in an antidumping review of concrete reinforcing bar from Mexico conducted during the 2019 coronavirus pandemic. Despite the challenges posed by the pandemic, Commerce denied Grupo Simec’s extension request, and the resulting missing information led Commerce to resort to adverse facts available to calculate Grupo Simec’s dumping margin. This, in turn, impacted the rate for the companies not selected for review. In its previous opinion, the Court remanded the case to Commerce with three directives: (1) to reopen the record and accept Grupo Simec’s filing, (2) to conduct a new analysis to determine whether the use of an adverse inference was warranted, and (3) to reanalyze the non-selected company rate used in the final determination. Since Commerce complied with the Court’s remand order and no party objected to the remand determination, the Court sustained Commerce’s remand determination.

## COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

### *Summary of Decisions*

### [Appeal No. 23-2266: Pirelli Tyre Co., Ltd. v. United States](#)

The Federal Circuit reviewed Commerce’s separate rate analysis in the 2017-2018 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on passenger vehicle and light truck tires from China. Its decision upholding the underlying administrative review hinged on the finding that the burden lies with the respondent to counter Commerce’s de facto control test in the separate rate analysis. The three-judge panel held specifically that Commerce properly requires separate rate respondents to “carry a burden of persuasion to justify a separate rate.” After reviewing the administrative record, the Court also concluded that Commerce’s decisions were based upon a reasonable factual determination and that Pirelli had not established sufficient independence from government control given that it has an indirect relationship with two Chinese state-owned enterprises and properly applied the four factor test articulated in Commerce’s Separate Rate Policy Bulletin.

### [Appeal No. 23-1078: All One God Faith, Inc. v. United States](#)

The Federal Circuit sustained the CIT’s decision which stems from Customs and Border Protection’s antidumping evasion investigation under the Enforce and Protect Act (EAPA). The court affirmed that CBP did not have to refer the question of whether CP Kelco still produced oilfield xanthan gum to determine if evasion had occurred. The three-judge panel also concluded that CBP properly resorted to the use of adverse inferences due to the fact that the investigated manufacturers failed to submit the requested information regardless of the full participation of the importers which were concurrently subject to the same evasion proceeding. Finally, the Federal Circuit concluded that the CIT erred in its jurisdiction finding when it stated that it did not have jurisdiction over entries which were liquidated that the importer protested but failed to appeal under Section 1581(a) as the court still had jurisdiction under 1581(c) as part of the appeal of the evasion determination.

## EXPORT CONTROLS AND SANCTIONS

### BIS Freezes All New Export License Applications

The Bureau of Industry and Security (“BIS”) quietly paused all reviews of new export license applications submitted this month, citing a “policy review.” As of February 28, 2025, that freeze appears to have been lifted in part as BIS has resumed processing of at least some license applications. However, the agency did not and has not commented publicly on the reasons for the pause or what specific aspects of policy are being examined.

This would not be the first time BIS has placed a hold on new licenses. In the past, the agency has paused licenses for exports to specific end-users, such as China’s Semiconductor Manufacturing International Corp. and Huawei, in order to address sensitive policy issues. In 2023, BIS also implemented an indefinite hold on new export licenses for firearms, components, and ammunition to Peru, Ecuador, and Guatemala.

### No Changes to Russia Sanctions or Export Controls Despite U.S. Beginning Talks, But DOJ Disbands Enforcement Task Force

This month, the U.S. began efforts to negotiate an end to the war in Ukraine. As part of those talks, several U.S. officials, including Secretary of State Marco Rubio and Treasury Secretary Scott Bessent, indicated that the U.S.’s sanctions against Russia, in place since February 2022, would likely be a point of discussion and could be expanded or eased depending on how discussions progress. No modifications have been made to date.

On February 5, 2025, Attorney General Pam Bondi issued a memorandum disbanding the inter-agency Task Force KleptoCapture—along with the Kleptocracy Team, and Kleptocracy Asset Recovery Initiative—which was created following Russia’s invasion of Ukraine to enforce the vast sanctions, export controls, and economic countermeasures imposed on Russia. The Task Force included prosecutors, agents, analysts, and professional staff from a variety of law enforcement agencies, and although it remains to be seen, its unwinding may signal a more relaxed approach to Russian sanctions enforcement or the prioritization of other foreign policy objectives.

### President Trump Orders Escalation of Sanctions Enforcement Against Iran

This month, President Trump issued a National Security Memorandum (“NSM”) directing multiple U.S. departments and agencies—including the Commerce, Treasury, and Justice Departments—to escalate enforcement of the sanctions and related enforcement remedies against Iran. The NSM specifically directs the Treasury Department (through its Office of Foreign Assets Control) to conduct a “review for modification or rescission any general license, frequently asked question, or other guidance that provides Iran or any of its terror proxies any degree of economic or financial relief.”

### New NSPM Calls for Changes to CFIUS Process and Outbound Investment Rules

On Friday, February 21, 2025, President Trump issued a National Security Presidential Memorandum (“NSPM”) which directed the Treasury Department and other cabinet agencies to implement various changes to the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States (“CFIUS”) process for reviewing foreign investments in the United States with the potential to harm United States national security.

Among other things, the NSPM called for the creation of a new “fast track” process which would expedite reviews for foreign investors who agree to avoid partnering with the People’s Republic of China and other designated foreign adversaries and also vowed to use the CFIUS process to protect United States farmland. The NSPM also forecasted that the Trump Administration will act to adopt further restrictions to prevent United States persons from investing in sectors of the PRC which could raise national security concerns. The NSPM did not establish any required timeline for the implementation of these rules; it is also unclear whether the Trump Administration is capable of enacting the full slate of proposed rules using Executive Branch action alone. Husch Blackwell’s International Trade Insights blog discussed the NSPM in greater detail in [this blog post](#).