

case briefs not later than 15 days after the date of publication of this notice. See 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii). Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed not later than 20 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit case briefs or rebuttal briefs in this changed circumstances review are requested to submit with each argument: (1) A statement of the issue; and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Consistent with 19 CFR 351.216(e), we will issue the final results of this changed-circumstances review no later than 270 days after the date on which this review was initiated, or within 45 days of publication of these preliminary results if all parties agree to our preliminary finding.

During the course of this antidumping duty changed circumstances review, the cash deposit requirements for the subject merchandise exported and manufactured by Lamina y Placa will continue to be the all-others rate established in the investigation. See *Notice of Antidumping Duty Orders: Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Brazil, the Republic of Korea (Korea), Mexico, and Venezuela, and Amendment to Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Circular Welded Non-Alloy Steel Pipe from Korea*, 57 FR 49453 (November 2, 1992).

This notice of initiation and preliminary results is published in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act, and 19 CFR 351.216 and 19 CFR 351.221(c)(3).

Dated: November 15, 2010.

Ronald K. Lorentzen,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 2010-29384 Filed 11-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Regulations and Procedures Technical Advisory Committee; Notice of Partially Closed Meeting

The Regulations and Procedures Technical Advisory Committee (RPTAC) will meet December 8, 2010, 9 a.m., Room 3884, in the Herbert C. Hoover Building, 14th Street between Constitution and Pennsylvania Avenues, NW., Washington, DC. The Committee advises the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration on implementation of the Export Administration Regulations

(EAR) and provides for continuing review to update the EAR as needed.

Agenda

Public Session

1. Opening remarks by the Chairman.
2. Opening remarks by Bureau of Industry and Security.
3. Export Enforcement update.
4. Regulations update.
5. Working group reports.
6. Automated Export System (AES) update.
7. Presentation of papers or comments by the Public.

Closed Session

8. Discussion of matters determined to be exempt from the provisions relating to public meetings found in 5 U.S.C. app. 2 §§ 10(a)(1) and 10(a)(3).

The open session will be accessible via teleconference to 20 participants on a first come, first serve basis. To join the conference, submit inquiries to Ms. Yvette Springer at Yspringer@bis.doc.gov no later than December 1, 2010.

A limited number of seats will be available for the public session. Reservations are not accepted. To the extent that time permits, members of the public may present oral statements to the Committee. The public may submit written statements at any time before or after the meeting. However, to facilitate the distribution of public presentation materials to the Committee members, the Committee suggests that presenters forward the public presentation materials prior to the meeting to Ms. Springer via email.

The Assistant Secretary for Administration, with the concurrence of the delegate of the General Counsel, formally determined on November 3, 2010, pursuant to Section 10(d) of the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (5 U.S.C. app. 2 § (10)(d)), that the portion of the meeting dealing with matters the disclosure of which would be likely to frustrate significantly implementation of an agency action as described in 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(9)(B) shall be exempt from the provisions relating to public meetings found in 5 U.S.C. app. 2 §§ 10(a)1 and 10(a)(3). The remaining portions of the meeting will be open to the public.

For more information, call Yvette Springer at (202) 482-2813.

Dated: November 17, 2010.

Yvette Springer,

Committee Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 2010-29374 Filed 11-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-JT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of Industry and Security

Action Affecting Export Privileges; Anvik Technologies Sdn. Bhd., a/k/a Anvik Technologies; Babak Jafarpour, a/k/a Bob Jefferson

Anvik Technologies Sdn. Bhd., a/k/a Anvik Technologies
Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered,
30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 50250, Malaysia
Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450, Malaysia
Level 19, Two International Finance Centre, 8 Finance Street Central Hong Kong
155 North Wacker Drive, 42nd Floor, Chicago, IL 60606; and
Babak Jafarpour, a/k/a Bob Jefferson
Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered,
30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 50250, Malaysia
Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450, Malaysia
Level 19, Two International Finance Centre, 8 Finance Street Central Hong Kong
155 North Wacker Drive, 42nd Floor, Chicago, IL 60606
Respondents.

Order Temporarily Denying Export Privileges

Pursuant to Section 766.24 of the Export Administration Regulations ("EAR" or the "Regulations"),¹ the Bureau of Industry and Security ("BIS"), U.S. Department of Commerce, through its Office of Export Enforcement ("OEE"), has requested that I issue an Order temporarily denying, for a period of 180 days, the export privileges under the EAR of:

1. Anvik Technologies Sdn. Bhd. a/k/a Anvik Technologies.
Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered,
30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 50250, Malaysia.
Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450, Malaysia.
Level 19, Two International Finance Centre, 8 Finance Street Central

¹ The EAR is currently codified at 15 CFR parts 730-774 (2010). The EAR are issued under the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. app. §§ 2401-2420 (2000)) ("EAA"). Since August 21, 2001, the Act has been in lapse and the President, through Executive Order 13222 of August 17, 2001 (3 CFR, 2001 Comp. 783 (2002)), which has been extended by successive presidential notices, the most recent being that of August 12, 2010 (75 FR 50681 (Aug. 16, 2010)), has continued the Regulations in effect under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701, et seq.) ("IEEPA").

- Hong Kong.
155 North Wacker Drive, 42nd Floor,
Chicago, IL 60606.²
2. Babak Jafarpour a/k/a Bob Jefferson.
Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered,
30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala
Lumpur 50250, Malaysia.
Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan
Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450,
Malaysia.
Level 19, Two International Finance
Centre, 8 Finance Street Central
Hong Kong.
155 North Wacker Drive, 42nd Floor,
Chicago, IL 60606.³

Legal Standard

Pursuant to Section 766.24(b) of the Regulations, BIS may issue a TDO upon a showing that the order is necessary in the public interest to prevent an “imminent violation” of the Regulations. 15 CFR 766.24(b)(1). “A violation may be ‘imminent’ either in time or degree of likelihood.” 15 CFR 766.24(b)(3). BIS may show “either that a violation is about to occur, or that the general circumstances of the matter under investigation or case under criminal or administrative charges demonstrate a likelihood of future violations.” *Id.* As to the likelihood of future violations, BIS may show that “the violation under investigation or charges is significant, deliberate, covert and/or likely to occur again, rather than technical or negligent[.]” *Id.* A “lack of information establishing the precise time a violation may occur does not preclude a finding that a violation is imminent, so long as there is sufficient reason to believe the likelihood of a violation.” *Id.*

Background and Findings

OEE has presented evidence that, on multiple occasions, beginning in October 2009 and continuing to date, Anvik Technologies Sdn. Bhd. (“Anvik”), and its owner and operator Babak Jafarpour, have procured and attempted to procure various items subject to the Regulations for export from the United States to Iran, via transshipment through third countries, including Malaysia and Hong Kong, without obtaining the required authorization from the U.S. Government.

² As explained further below, this address is an address for “virtual office space” leased by Respondents from a company called Servcorp. See note 4. *infra*. It is BIS’s understanding that other persons also rent “virtual office space” at this address. The only current users at this address subject to this Temporary Denial Order as issued are the Respondents listed above. Other persons currently using this address are not subject to the Order.

³ See footnote 2 above.

OEE, through its investigation, has provided evidence that Anvik and Jafarpour (hereinafter collectively referred to as “Respondents”) have been utilizing a global network of leased “virtual offices”⁴ to procure items from the United States and ship those items to Iran through third countries. Respondents use the leased virtual office space in order to obtain various addresses, including the addresses in Malaysia and Hong Kong, that Respondents then provide to suppliers as the ultimate destination and end-users of the items while disguising the true ultimate destination and end-users in Iran. OEE has identified at least four transactions where the Respondents have shipped or attempted to ship items to Iran using the same method of operation, including two attempted exports to Iran as recently as September 2010. In this section, I discuss evidence obtained by OEE relating to those transactions and submitted to me in support of its TDO request.

Between February and June 2010, Respondents exchanged email messages with a U.S. manufacturer concerning the procurement of microwave mixers and bias tees. These items, which are components used in communications and radar systems, are subject to the Regulations and designated as EAR99. Respondents’ email messages with the U.S. manufacturer originated in Iran. However, Respondents completed an end-user statement that they provided to the U.S. manufacturer stating that the microwave mixers and bias tees were to be used by Anvik at its address at 155 North Wacker Drive, 42nd Floor, Chicago, IL 60606.

On September 7, 2010, on the instructions of Respondents, the U.S. manufacturer shipped the microwave mixers and bias tees to the address in Chicago provided by Respondents. However, the Chicago, IL address is for the “virtual office” at which Respondents do not occupy any physical space or otherwise have operations that would enable them to use these items there, and instead only lease certain services, such as remote receptionist and administrative support and use of the local phone number and address. When the microwave mixers and bias tees arrived in Chicago, the “virtual office” staff, on the instructions

⁴ A “virtual office” arrangement provides users with communication and physical office services available to a typical lessee of office space, providing the appearance that the user maintains an office at the virtual office location. Virtual office users can use phone numbers, physical/ mailing addresses, receptionist services, etc. without actually leasing space or ever being present at the virtual office.

of Respondent Jafarpour, replaced the manufacturer’s invoice with one provided by him and shipped the items to another of Respondents’ “virtual office” addresses, at Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered, 30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 50250, Malaysia. Jafarpour instructed the virtual office staff in Malaysia to forward the package to Iran upon receipt. However, the shipment was stopped in Malaysia prior to being delivered to the virtual office address there.

As provided in Section 746.7 of the Regulations, no person may export or reexport any item that is subject to the EAR, if such transaction is prohibited by the Iranian Transactions Regulations (31 CFR part 560) and has not been authorized by OFAC. The evidence shows that using the scheme described above, Respondents took actions to evade the Regulations by exporting microwave mixers and bias tees from the United States to Iran through Malaysia. Respondents intended to have the shipment relabeled and delivered to a forwarder/shipper for transshipment to Iran once it arrived in Malaysia. Respondents had not sought or received the required U.S. Government authorization.

OEE’s investigation has uncovered another recent attempt by Respondents to procure items for Iranian end-users in violation of the Regulations. Beginning in or about September 2010, Respondents attempted to export GPS timing boards, items subject to the Regulations, classified as Export Control Classification Number 7A994, and controlled for anti-terrorism reasons, from the United States to Iran without the license required under Section 742.8 of the Regulations to export or reexport anti-terrorism controlled items to Iran. The order was placed with a U.S. manufacturer through its Swedish distributor. The purchase order submitted by Anvik stated that the terms of delivery were “FOB USA,” indicating that Respondents knew the items were being exported from the United States. Respondents ordered the GPS timing boards using an address at Level 19, Two International Finance Centre, 8 Finance Street Central, Hong Kong. This address is “virtual office” space leased by Respondents. Respondents provided a different address, at Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered, 30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 50250, Malaysia, as the “ship to” address on the order form. This address also is “virtual office” space leased by Respondents. The shipping label on the package that arrived at Respondent Anvik’s address in Malaysia stated that it was from the U.S.

manufacturer in New York, United States, and the packing list included an export control warning from the U.S. manufacturer and a certificate of U.S. origin. Information provided by the forwarder demonstrates that, once the GPS timing boards were delivered to the address in Malaysia, they were immediately relabeled for shipment by the same forwarder to Iran. The shipment from Malaysia to Iran was stopped in Singapore while en route to Iran.

OEE also has uncovered other transactions in which Respondents were able to successfully procure items subject to the Regulations and cause their export from the United States to Iran via transshipment through third countries. Respondents used methods similar to those described above, having the items shipped to "virtual offices" they leased abroad and then transshipping the items from there to Iran.

In September 2009, Respondents placed an order with a U.S. manufacturer through its Singapore-based distributor for ten digital phase shifters. These items, which have a number of uses, including in radar systems, satellite communications, phase cancellation and beamforming modules, are subject to the Regulations and designated as EAR99. Respondents provided the U.S. manufacturer and its distributor with an end-user statement indicating that the digital phase shifters would be used by Anvik at Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450, Malaysia, and certifying that the items "will not be diverted to any country, company or individual that is prohibited by the U.S. Government." The address listed on the end-user statement is a "virtual office" address leased by Respondents. On October 19, 2009, the U.S. manufacturer exported the digital phase shifters to Anvik in Malaysia via the distributor in Singapore. Evidence uncovered by OEE demonstrates that, once the package arrived in Malaysia, Respondents promptly instructed the "virtual office" staff to ship the package to ECI Co. in Shiraz, Iran. Respondents did not obtain the required U.S. Government authorization to export the digital phase shifters from the United States to Iran.

On October 27, 2009, a U.S. manufacturer exported a millidioptrimeter to Anvik at Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450, Malaysia. This item, which is a measuring tool used for various optical systems, including those in aircraft systems, is subject to the Regulations and designated as EAR99. The address provided by Anvik is a

virtual office address leased by Respondents. Evidence obtained by OEE indicates that, at the request of Respondent Jafarpour, the virtual office staff arranged for the millidioptrimeter to be promptly transshipped on Respondents' behalf from Malaysia to IOI (Isfahan Optics Institute), a subsidiary of Iran Electronics Industries in Isfahan, Iran.⁵ Respondents did not obtain the required U.S. Government authorization to export the digital phase shifters from the United States to Iran.

In addition to the evidence discussed above showing continued deliberate and covert actions by Anvik and Jafarpour to cause or attempt to cause items to be exported from the United States to Iran via third countries without obtaining U.S. Government authorization, BIS also has submitted direct evidence that Respondents had actual knowledge of the U.S. embargo against Iran. For example, in communications in June 2009, with a prospective supplier based in Canada, Respondent Jafarpour acknowledges knowing that the United States maintains an embargo against Iran.

OEE submits, in sum, that future violations of the EAR are imminent as defined in Section 766.24 of the Regulations. I agree based on the evidence of Respondents' continued deliberate, significant, and covert efforts to procure items from the United States for export to Iran via third countries without the required U.S. Government authorization, including by providing false information to U.S. companies about end-users in an effort to prevent U.S. law enforcement officials from discovering and ultimately stopping Respondents' conduct. Accordingly, I find that the evidence presented by OEE demonstrates that a violation of the Regulations by Respondents is imminent in both time and degree of likelihood. The conduct in this case is deliberate, significant, and likely to occur again absent the issuance of a TDO. As such, a TDO is needed to give notice to persons and companies in the United States and abroad that they should cease dealing with the Respondents in export transactions involving items subject to the EAR.

⁵ On September 17, 2008, the U.S. Department of Treasury designated Iran Electronics Industries as a Weapons of Mass Destruction proliferator or supporter pursuant to Executive Order 13382. Iran Electronics Industries was designated because it is owned or controlled by Iran's Ministry of Defense and Armed Forces Logistics (MODAFL). MODAFL, which was designated under Executive Order 13382 on October 25, 2007, controls other previously designated entities DIO, and Aerospace Industries Organization, which is the overall manager and coordinator of Iran's missile program.

Accordingly, I find that a TDO naming Anvik Technologies Sdn. Bhd. and Babak Jafarpour is necessary, in the public interest, to prevent an imminent violation of the EAR.

This Order is being issued on an *ex parte* basis without a hearing based upon BIS's showing of an imminent violation.

I. Order

It is therefore ordered:

First, that the Respondents, Anvik Technologies SDN. BHD. also known as ("a/k/a") Anvik Technologies, Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered, 30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 50250, Malaysia; Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450, Malaysia; Level 19, Two International Finance Centre, 8 Finance Street Central, Hong Kong; 155 North Wacker Drive, 42nd Floor, Chicago, IL 60606; Babak Jafarpour a/k/a Bob Jefferson, Level 20, Menara Standard Chartered, 30 Jalan Sultan Ismail, Kuala Lumpur 50250, Malaysia; Level 36, Menara Citibank, 165 Jalan Ampang, Kuala Lumpur 50450, Malaysia; Level 19, Two International Finance Centre, 8 Finance Street Central, Hong Kong; 155 North Wacker Drive, 42nd Floor, Chicago, IL 60606, and each of their successors or assigns and, when acting for or on behalf of any of the foregoing, each of their officers, representatives, agents or employees (each a "Denied Person" and collectively the "Denied Persons") may not, directly or indirectly, participate in any way in any transaction involving any commodity, software or technology (hereinafter collectively referred to as "item") exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the Export Administration Regulations ("EAR"), or in any other activity subject to the EAR including, but not limited to:

A. Applying for, obtaining, or using any license, License Exception, or export control document;

B. Carrying on negotiations concerning, or ordering, buying, receiving, using, selling, delivering, storing, disposing of, forwarding, transporting, financing, or otherwise servicing in any way, any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR; or

C. Benefitting in any way from any transaction involving any item exported or to be exported from the United States that is subject to the EAR, or in any other activity subject to the EAR.

Second, that no person may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

A. Export or reexport to or on behalf of a Denied Person any item subject to the EAR;

B. Take any action that facilitates the acquisition or attempted acquisition by a Denied Person of the ownership, possession, or control of any item subject to the EAR that has been or will be exported from the United States, including financing or other support activities related to a transaction whereby a Denied Person acquires or attempts to acquire such ownership, possession or control;

C. Take any action to acquire from or to facilitate the acquisition or attempted acquisition from a Denied Person of any item subject to the EAR that has been exported from the United States;

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

Third, that, after notice and opportunity for comment as provided in section 766.23 of the EAR, any other person, firm, corporation, or business organization related to a Denied Person by affiliation, ownership, control, or position of responsibility in the conduct of trade or related services may also be made subject to the provisions of this Order.

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

In accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(e) of the EAR, the Respondents may, at any time, appeal this Order by filing a full written statement in support of the appeal with the Office of the Administrative Law Judge, U.S. Coast Guard ALJ Docketing Center, 40 South Gay Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21202-4022.

BIS may seek renewal of this Order by filing a written request with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement in accordance with the provisions of Section 766.24(d) of the EAR, which currently provides that

such a written request must be submitted not later than 20 days before the expiration date. A Respondent may oppose a request to renew this Order in accordance with Section 766.24(d), including by filing a written submission with the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement, supported by appropriate evidence. Any opposition ordinarily must be received not later than seven days before the expiration date of the Order.

Notice of the issuance of this Order shall be given to Respondents in accordance with Sections 766.5(b) and 766.24(b)(5) of the Regulations. This Order also shall be published in the **Federal Register**.

This Order is effective immediately and shall remain in effect for 180 days.

Issued this 15th day of November 2010.

David W. Mills,

Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Export Enforcement.

[FR Doc. 2010-29327 Filed 11-19-10; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DT-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration [C-570-938]

Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts From People's Republic of China: Partial Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

DATES: *Effective Date:* November 22, 2010.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Seth Isenberg or Patricia Tran, AD/CVD Operations, Office 1, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482-0588 and (202) 482-1503, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 3, 2010, the U.S. Department of Commerce ("Department") issued a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this order for the period of review ("POR") September 19, 2008, through December 31, 2009. *See Antidumping or Countervailing Duty Order, Finding, or Suspended Investigation; Opportunity To Request Administrative Review*, 75 FR 23236-37 (May 3, 2010). On June 1, 2010, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), the Department received a timely request from Archer Daniels Midland Company,

Cargill, Incorporated, and Tate & Lyle Americas LLC (collectively, "Petitioners") to conduct an administrative review of 56 companies.

On June 30, 2010, the Department published the notice of initiation of this countervailing duty administrative review, covering the 56 companies. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part*, 75 FR 37759 (June 30, 2010). On August 17, 2010, the Department issued a respondent selection memorandum selecting RZBC Co., Ltd./RZBC Import & Export Co., Ltd. and RZBC (Juxian) Co., Ltd. (collectively, "RZBC"); and Yixing Union Biochemical Co., Ltd. and Yixing Union Cogeneration Co., Ltd. (collectively, "Yixing-Union") as mandatory respondents. *See Memorandum to Susan H. Kuhbach from Patricia M. Tran, regarding Respondent Selection: Countervailing Duty Administrative Review—Citric Acid and Certain Citrate Salts* (August 17, 2010).

Partial Rescission of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), the Secretary will rescind an administrative review, in whole or in part, if the party who requested the administrative review withdraws the request within 90 days of the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the requested administrative review. On September 27, 2010, Petitioners withdrew their request for an administrative review of the following companies:

A.H.A. International Co., Ltd.
Changsha Huari Bio Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd.
Changsha Huayang Chemical Co., Ltd.
China North Industry Guangzhou Corporation
Feiyu Fine Chemical
Gansu Xuejing Biochemical Co., Ltd.
Great Vision International
Hai Hui Group Co., Ltd.
High Hope International Group Jiangsu Native
Produce Import & Export Co., Ltd.
Huangshi Xinghua Biochemical Co., Ltd.
Hunan Dongting Citric Acid Chemicals Co., Ltd.
Hunan Yinhai Petrochemicals Group Co., Ltd.
Jiali Bio Group (Qingdao) Limited
Jiangsu Gadot Nuobei Biochemical
Jiangsu Nuobei Biochemical Co., Ltd.
Juxian Hongde Citric Acid Co., Ltd.
Kelong International Co., Ltd.
Laiwu Taihe Biochemistry Co. Ltd.
Lianyungang Best Biochemical Technology Co. Ltd.
Lianyungang Famous Chemical, Ltd.
Lianyungang JF International Trade Co., Ltd.
Lianyungang Nuobei Biochemical Technology Co., Ltd.
Lianyungang Reliance