

any item subject to the Regulations that has been exported from the United States;

D. Obtain from the Denied Person in the United States any item subject to the Regulations with knowledge or reason to know that the item will be, or is intended to be, exported from the United States; or

E. Engage in any transaction to service any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States and which is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person, or service any item, of whatever origin, that is owned, possessed or controlled by the Denied Person if such service involves the use of any item subject to the Regulations that has been or will be exported from the United States. For purposes of this paragraph, servicing means installation, maintenance, repair, modification or testing.

III. After notice and opportunity for comment as provided in Section 766.23 of the Regulations, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to Liu by affiliation, ownership, control or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be subject to the provisions of this Order if necessary to prevent evasion of the Order.

IV. This Order does not prohibit any export, reexport, or other transaction subject to the Regulations where the only items involved that are subject to the Regulations are the foreign-produced direct product of U.S.-origin technology.

V. This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect until March 26, 2023.

VI. In accordance with Part 756 of the Regulations, Liu may file an appeal of this Order with the Under Secretary of Commerce for Industry and Security. The appeal must be filed within 45 days from the date of this Order and must comply with the provisions of Part 756 of the Regulations.

VII. A copy of this Order shall be delivered to the Liu. This Order shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

Issued this 18th day of September, 2013.

Bernard Kritzer,

Director, Office of Exporter Services.

[FR Doc. 2013-23141 Filed 9-23-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-557-805]

Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

AGENCY: Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

DATES: *Effective Date:* [Insert date of publication in the **Federal Register**].

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Elizabeth Eastwood, AD/CVD Operations, Office 2, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC, 20230; telephone (202) 482-3874.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Amended Final Results

On March 16, 1998, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia.¹ The period of review (POR) is October 1, 1995, through September 30, 1996.

Following the publication of the final results, Heveafil Sdn. Bhd.² and Filmax Sdn. Bhd. (collectively, "Heveafil") filed a lawsuit with the United States Court of International Trade (CIT) challenging the Department's use of adverse facts available (AFA) to determine its dumping margin. On February 28, 2001, the CIT affirmed the Department's *Final Results* in relevant part.³

Heveafil appealed the CIT's February 28, 2001, decision before the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC). On March 19, 2003, the CAFC affirmed the Department's use of AFA to determine Heveafil's dumping margin in the *Final Results*; however, it remanded to the CIT the specific rate assigned as AFA because the source of the corroboration of this rate was invalidated after the *Final Results*.⁴

¹ See *Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 12752 (Mar. 16, 1998) (*Final Results*).

² Heveafil Sdn. Bhd. is also known as Heveafil Sdn.

³ See *Heveafil et al. v. United States*, Slip Op. 2001-23 (CIT 2001). While the CIT remanded to the Department its duty absorption inquiry, on August 9, 2001, it affirmed the Department's final results of remand redetermination on this issue. As the result of the remand redetermination, the Department did not change Heveafil's AFA rate.

⁴ See *Heveafil Sdn. Bhd. v. U.S.*, 58 Fed. Appx. 843 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

Pursuant to the CAFC's decision, on May 28, 2003, the CIT remanded this case to the Department to assign a new AFA margin to Heveafil.⁵ On September 4, 2003, the Department filed its remand results with the Court, assigning Heveafil a revised AFA margin of 52.89 percent.⁶

On June 25, 2013, the United States and Heveafil entered into an agreement to settle this dispute and requested a stipulated judgment. On September 4, 2013, the CIT issued an order of stipulated judgment. Consistent with the June 2013 agreement and the stipulated judgment, we will instruct U.S. Customs and Border Protection to liquidate all unliquidated entries of certain extruded rubber thread from Malaysia produced and/or exported by Heveafil, and entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption in the United States during the POR at the rate of duty in effect at the time of entry. However, we are not establishing a revised cash deposit rate for Heveafil because the antidumping duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia was revoked on August 24, 2004, with an effective date of October 1, 2003.⁷

We are issuing this determination and publishing these amended final results and notice in accordance with 19 U.S.C. 1516a(e).

Dated: September 18, 2013.

Paul Piquado,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2013-23208 Filed 9-23-13; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

U.S. Environmental Solutions Toolkit

AGENCY: International Trade Administration, DOC.

ACTION: Notice and Request for Comment.

SUMMARY: This notice sets forth a request for input from U.S. businesses capable of exporting their goods or services relevant to (a) arsenic removal

⁵ See *Heveafil Sdn. Bhd. and Filati Lastex Sdn. Bhd. v. United States*, Court No. 98-00908 (CIT May 28, 2003).

⁶ The Court had stayed this litigation pending the outcome of a challenge to the effective date of the revocation of the order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia. See *Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Notice of Final Results of Changed Circumstances Review of the Antidumping Duty Order and Intent To Revoke Antidumping Duty Order*, 69 FR 51989 (Aug. 24, 2004) (*Revocation of AD Order*).

⁷ See *Revocation of AD Order*, 69 FR at 51989.