	Period
Moldova: Solid Urea, A–841–801	7/1/95–6/30/96
Romania: Solid Urea, A–485–601	7/1/95–6/30/96
Russia: Ferrovanadium, A–821–807	1/4/95–6/30/96
Russia: Solid Urea, A–821–801	7/1/95–6/30/96
South Korea: Industrial Nitrocellulose, A–580–805	7/1/95–6/30/96
Tajikistan: Solid Urea, A–842–801	7/1/95–6/30/96
Thailand: Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings, A–549–807	7/1/95–6/30/96
Thailand: Canned Pineapple, A–549–813	1/11/95–6/30/96
Thailand: Furfuryl Alcohol, A–549–812	5/8/95–6/30/96
The People's Republic of China: Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings, A–570–814	7/1/95–6/30/96
The People's Republic of China: Industrial Nitrocellulose, A–570–802	7/1/95–6/30/96
The People's Republic of China: Sebacic Acid, A–570–825	7/1/95–6/30/96
The Ukraine: Solid Urea, A–823–801	7/1/95–6/30/96
The United Kingdom: Industrial Nitrocellulose, A–412–803	7/1/95–6/30/96
Turkmenistan: Solid Urea, A–843–801	7/1/95–6/30/96
Uzbekistan: Solid Urea, A–844–801	7/1/95–6/30/96
Countervailing Duty Proceeding:	
European Economic Community: Sugar, C–408–046	1/1/95–12/31/95

In accordance with sections 353.22(a) and 355.22(a) of the regulations, an interested party as defined by section 353.2(k) may request in writing that the Secretary conduct an administrative review. The Department has changed its requirements for requesting reviews for countervailing duty orders. Pursuant to 19 C.F.R. 355.22(a) of the Department's Interim Regulations (60 FR 25137 (May 11, 1995)), an interested party must specify the individual producers or exporters covered by the order for which they are requesting a review. Therefore, for both antidumping and countervailing duty reviews, the interested party must specify for which individual producers or exporters covered by an antidumping finding or an antidumping or countervailing duty order it is requesting a review, and the requesting party must state why it desires the Secretary to review those particular producers or exporters. If the interested party intends for the Secretary to review sales of merchandise by an exporter (or a producer if that producer also exports merchandise from other suppliers) which were produced in more than one country of origin, and each country of origin is subject to a separate order, then the interested party must state specifically, on an order-by-order basis, which exporter(s) the request is intended to cover.

Seven copies of the request should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B–099, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. The Department also asks parties to serve a copy of their requests to the Office of Antidumping Compliance, Attention: Pamela Woods, in room 3065 of the main Commerce Building. Further, in accordance with section 353.31(g) or 355.31(g) of the regulations, a copy of each request must be served on every party on the Department's service list.

The Department will publish in the Federal Register a notice of ''Initiation of Antidumping (Countervailing) Duty Administrative Review,'' for requests received by the last day of July 1996. If the Department does not receive, by the last day of July 1996, a request for review of entries covered by an order or finding listed in this notice and for the period identified above, the Department will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping or countervailing duties on those entries at a rate equal to the cash deposit of (or bond for) estimated antidumping or countervailing duties required on those entries at the time of entry, or withdrawal from warehouse, for consumption and to continue to collect the cash deposit previously ordered.

This notice is not required by statute, but is published as a service to the international trading community.

Dated: June 28, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–17279 Filed 7–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

[A–427–801, A–428–801, A–475–801, A–588–804, A–485–801, A–559–801, A–549–801, A–412–801]

Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Thailand and the United Kingdom; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from interested parties, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof (AFBs) from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore and the United Kingdom. The classes or kinds of merchandise covered by these orders are ball bearings and parts thereof (BBs), cylindrical roller bearings and parts thereof (CRBs), and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof (SPBs). The reviews cover 27 manufacturers/exporters. The period of review (the POR) is May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995.

Although we initiated reviews for seven other manufacturers/exporters, we are terminating the reviews because the requests for these reviews were withdrawn in a timely manner. In addition, the Department is terminating reviews of the orders on BBs from Romania and Thailand. The sole request

we received regarding Romania was withdrawn. Regarding Thailand, on June 21, 1996, we issued the final results of the 1993–1994 administrative review revoking the order on BBs from Thailand, effective May 1, 1994.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV) by various companies subject to these reviews. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of these administrative reviews, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the export price (EP) or constructed export price (CEP) and the NV.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments in these proceedings are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 8, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: The appropriate case analyst, for the various respondent firms listed below, at the Office of Antidumping Compliance, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

France

Andrea Chu (Intertechnique, SNFA, SNR), Hermes Pinilla (Franke GmbH, Hoesch Rothe Erde, Rollix Defontaine), Matthew Rosenbaum (SKF), or Michael Rill.

Germany

Thomas Barlow (Torrington Nadellager), Davina Hashmi (INA), Chip Hayes (NTN Kugellagerfabrik), Hermes Pinilla (Franke GmbH, Hoesch Rothe Erde and Rollix Defontaine), Matthew Rosenbaum (SKF), Thomas Schauer (FAG), Michael Rill, or Richard Rimlinger.

Italy

Kris Campbell (SKF), Michael Rausher (FAG), Michael Rill, or Richard Rimlinger.

Japan

J. David Dirstine (Koyo Seiko), Chip Hayes (NTN), Michael Panfeld (NPBS), Mark Ross (Asahi Seiko), Thomas Schauer (NSK Ltd.), or Richard Rimlinger.

Singapore

Lyn Johnson (NMB/Pelmec) or Richard Rimlinger.

United Kingdom

Andrea Chu (Hoffman U.K.), Hermes Pinilla (NSK/RHP), Matthew Rosenbaum (Rose Bearing Co., Ltd.), or Michael Rill.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA).

Background

On May 15, 1989, the Department published in the Federal Register (54 FR 20909) the antidumping duty orders on BBs, CRBs, and SPBs from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. Specifically, these orders cover BBs, CRBs, and SPBs from France, Germany, and Japan; BBs and CRBs from Italy, Sweden and the U.K.; and BBs from Romania, Singapore and Thailand. On June 19, 1995, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c), we initiated administrative reviews of certain of these orders for the period May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995 (60 FR 31952). The Department is now conducting these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Subsequent to the initiation of these reviews, we received timely withdrawals of review requests for Fichtel & Sachs AG (Germany), Jidosha Buhin Kogyo Co., Ltd. (Japan), Naiico Spicer Co., Ltd. (Japan), Nissan Trading Co., Ltd. (Japan), Izumoto Seiko Co., Ltd. (Japan), Tehnoimportexport, S.A. (Romania), Barden Corporation (United Kingdom), and Normalair-Garrett Ltd. (United Kingdom). Because there were no other requests for review of these companies from any other interested parties, we are terminating the reviews with respect to these companies in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5). We are terminating the review of AFBs from Romania because Tehnoimportexport, S.A. was the only company for which a review of that order was requested.

We are terminating the review of AFBs from Thailand with respect to NMB Thai/Pelmec Thai because subsequent to the initiation of this review we revoked the antidumping duty order (see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from Thailand; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Revocation of Antidumping Duty Order,* issued June 21, 1996).

Scope of Reviews

The products covered by these reviews are AFBs and constitute the following classes or kinds of merchandise:

1. *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof:* These products include all antifriction bearings that employ balls as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classified under the following categories: antifriction balls, ball bearings with integral shafts, ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted ball bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following Harmonized Tariff Schedules (HTS) subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.10.10, 8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.05, 8482.99.10, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.6590, 8482.99.70, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.50.8040, 8483.50.90, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.60.80, 8708.70.6060, 8708.70.8050, 8708.93.30, 8708.93.5000, 8708.93.6000, 8708.93.75, 8708.99.06, 8708.99.31, 8708.99.4960, 8708.99.50, 8708.99.5800, 8708.99.8080, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, and 8803.90.90.

2. *Cylindrical Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof:* These products include all AFBs that employ cylindrical rollers as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classified under the following categories: antifriction rollers, all cylindrical roller bearings (including split cylindrical roller bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted cylindrical roller bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following HTS subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.40.00, 8482.50.00, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.25, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.6530, 8482.99.6560, 8482.99.6590, 8482.99.70, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.50.8040, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.93.5000, 8708.99.4000, 8708.99.4960, 8708.99.50, 8708.99.8080, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, and 8803.90.90.

3. *Spherical Plain Bearings and Parts Thereof:* These products include all spherical plain bearings that employ a spherically shaped sliding element.

Imports of these products are classified under the following HTS subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00,

4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.50.10, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.30, 8485.90.00, 8708.93.5000, 8708.99.50, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, and 8803.90.90.

The size or precision grade of a bearing does not influence whether the bearing is covered by the order. For a further discussion of the scope of the orders being reviewed, including recent scope determinations, see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al.; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 60 FR 10900 (February 28, 1995) (*AFBs IV*). The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

These reviews cover the following firms and classes or kinds of merchandise:

Name of firm	Class or kind
France	
Franke GmbH	BBs.
Hoesch Rothe-Erde AG	BBs.
Intertechnique	All.
Rollix Defontaine, S.A.	BBs.
SKF France (including all relevant affiliates)	All.
SNFA	BBs, CRBs.
Societe Nouvelle Roulements (SNR)	All.
Germany	
FAG Kugelfischer Georg Schaefer KGaA (FAG Germany)	All.
Franke GmbH	BBs.
Hoesch Rothe Erde AG	BBs.
INA Walzlager Schaeffler KG (INA)	All.
NTN Kugellagerfabrik (Deutschland) GmbH (NTN Germany)	All.
Rollix & Defontaine, S.A.	BBs.
SKF GmbH (including all relevant affiliates) (SKF Germany)	All.
Torrington Nadellager (Torrington/Kuensenbeck)	BBs, CRBs.
Italy	
FAG Italia S.p.A. (including all relevant affiliates) (FAG Italy)	BBs, CRBs.
SKF-Industrie S.p.A. (SKF Italy)	BBs.
Japan	
Asahi Seiko	BBs.
Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd.	All.
Nippon Pillow Block Sales Company, Ltd. (NPBS)	All.
NSK Ltd. (formerly Nippon Seiko K.K.)	All.
NTN Corp. (NTN Japan)	All.
Singapore	
NMB Singapore Ltd./Pelmec Ind. (Pte.) Ltd. (NMB Singapore/Pelmec)	BBs.
United Kingdom	
NSK Bearings Europe, Ltd./RHP Bearings (NSK/RHP)	BBs, CRBs.
Hoffman U.K.	BBs, CRBs.
Rose Bearing Co., Ltd.	BBs, CRBs.
Timken Bearing Co.	BBs, CRBs.

Certain respondents reported no shipments or sales subject to these reviews. One firm, Torrington Nadellager (Torrington/Kuensenbeck), reported entries of merchandise subject to the order on BBs from Germany but no sales to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers. Because this merchandise was consumed by the affiliated importer and not resold in any form, we will liquidate these entries without regard to antidumping duties.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by certain respondents, using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public versions of the verification reports.

Use of Facts Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of facts available as the basis for the weighted-average dumping margin is appropriate for SNFA, Hoffman U.K., and Rose Bearings, all with respect to BBs and CRBs, for Torrington Nadellager with respect to CRBs only, and for SKF France with respect to SPBs only, because these firms did not respond to our antidumping questionnaire. We find that these firms have withheld ''information that has been requested by the administering authority.'' Furthermore, we determine that, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, it is appropriate to make an inference adverse to the interests of these companies because they failed to cooperate by not responding to our questionnaire. For the weighted-average dumping margins of these firms, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the respective proceeding as adverse facts available, which is secondary information within the meaning of section 776(c) of the Act.

We also preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of the facts available as the basis for the weighted-average dumping margin is appropriate for NPBS because, despite the Department's attempts to verify information provided

by NPBS, the Department could not verify the information as required under section 782(i) of the Act. Where a party provides information requested by the Department but the information cannot be verified, section 776(a)(2)(D) of the Act requires the Department to use facts otherwise available. Further, in accordance with section 782(e)(2) of the Act, the Department has declined to consider information submitted by NPBS because the information cannot be verified. Moreover, we preliminarily determine that, pursuant to section 776(b) of the Act, NPBS did not cooperate to the best of its ability and therefore we are required to use adverse facts available.

We found that responses provided by NPBS, as a whole, could not be verified. At our attempted verification, for example, we found the following inaccuracies in the response provided by NPBS which render the response unusable for purposes of margin calculations: unreported home market and United States sales; inability to demonstrate how quantity and value totals were calculated; incorrect reporting of the form of the subject merchandise as entered; incorrect designation of bearings that were further processed in the United States; and failure to provide in its response to the questionnaire the final prices to its largest home market customer. In addition, we found errors in the calculation of the following items: entered customs value, all charges and adjustments allocated by entered value, customer category of U.S. sales, U.S. inland freight, U.S. international freight, U.S. short-term interest rate, export selling expenses incurred in the home market, indirect selling expenses for home market sales, and home market short-term interest income.

NPBS has not cooperated to the best of its ability, as demonstrated by the misreportings, inaccuracies, and omissions we found at our attempted verification which resulted from inconsistencies in data within NPBS's control. Therefore, as facts available for NPBS, we have used the ''all others'' rate from the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, which is considered secondary information within the meaning of section 776(c) of the Act.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate secondary information from independent sources reasonably at its disposal. The Statement of Administrative Action (SAA) provides that ''corroborate'' means simply that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value (see H.R. Doc. 316, Vol. 1, 103d Cong., 2d sess. 870 (1994)).

To corroborate secondary information, the Department will, to the extent practicable, examine the reliability and relevance of the information to be used. However, unlike for other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as total adverse facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period. With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin (see, e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 61 FR 6812, 6814 (February 22, 1996) (Fresh Cut Flowers) (where the Department disregarded the highest margin as adverse best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin)).

In this case, for SKF France, SNFA, Torrington Nadellager, Hoffman U.K. and Rose Bearings, we have used the highest rate from any prior segment of the respective proceeding as adverse facts available. This rate is the highest available rate and no evidence exists in the record that indicates that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available.

For NPBS, we examined the rates applicable to ball bearings from Japan throughout the course of the proceeding. Given NPBS's level of participation in this segment of the proceeding, we preliminarily determine that 45.83 percent, which is the all others rate from the LTFV investigation, is sufficiently adverse to encourage full cooperation in future segments of the proceeding. Moreover, this rate has probative value because it includes the average of calculated margins from the LTFV investigation. Furthermore, there is no reliable evidence on the record indicating that this selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available. (See, *e.g., Fresh Cut Flowers*.)

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used EP or CEP as defined in sections 772(a) and 772(b) of the Act, as appropriate. Due to the extremely large volume of transactions that occurred during the POR and the resulting administrative burden involved in calculating individual margins for all of these transactions, we sampled CEP sales in accordance with section 777A of the Act. When a firm made more than 2,000 CEP sales transactions to the United States for a particular class or kind of merchandise, we reviewed CEP sales that occurred during sample weeks. We selected one week from each two-month period in the review period, for a total of six weeks, and analyzed each transaction made in those six weeks. The sample weeks included May 1–7, 1994, August 21–27, 1994, October 2–8, 1994, November 6–12, 1994, January 22–28, 1995, and March 19–25, 1995. We reviewed all EP sales transactions during the POR.

We calculated EP and CEP based on the packed f.o.b., c.i.f., or delivered price to unaffiliated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. We made deductions, as appropriate, for discounts and rebates. We also made deductions for any movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act and the SAA (at 823–824), we calculated the CEP by deducting selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including commissions, direct selling expenses, expenses assumed on behalf of the buyer and indirect selling expenses, and repacking expenses in the United States. Where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act, we also deducted the cost of any further manufacture or assembly, except where the special rule provided in section 772(e) of the Act was applied (see below). Finally, we made an adjustment for an amount of profit allocated to these expenses in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

With respect to subject merchandise to which value was added in the United States prior to sale to unaffiliated U.S. customers, *e.g.*, parts of bearings that were imported and further processed into finished bearings by U.S. affiliates of foreign exporters, we determined that the special rule for merchandise with value added after importation under section 772(e) of the Act applied for all firms, except INA, that added value in the United States.

Section 772(e) of the Act provides that, where the subject merchandise is imported by an affiliated person and the value added in the United States by the affiliated person is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise, we shall determine the CEP for such merchandise using the price of identical or other subject merchandise if there is a sufficient quantity of sales to provide a reasonable basis for comparison and we determine that the use of such sales is appropriate. If there is not a sufficient quantity of such sales or if we determine that using the price of identical or other subject merchandise is not appropriate, we may use any other reasonable basis to determine the CEP.

To determine whether the value added is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise, we estimated the value added based on the difference between the averages of the prices charged to the first unaffiliated purchaser for the merchandise as sold in the United States and the averages of the prices paid for the subject merchandise by the affiliated person. Based on this analysis, we estimated, for all firms except INA that added value in the United States, that the value added was at least 60 percent of the price charged to the first unaffiliated customer for the merchandise as sold in the United States. Therefore, we determined that the value added is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise. Accordingly, for purposes of determining dumping margins for these sales, we have used the weighted-average dumping margins calculated on sales of identical or other subject merchandise sold to unaffiliated persons.

No other adjustments to EP or CEP were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales and absent any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country does not permit a proper comparison, we determined that the quantity of foreign like product each respondent sold in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act, because each company's quantity of sales in its home market was greater than five percent of its sales to the U.S. market. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based NV on the prices at which the foreign like products were first sold for consumption in the exporting country.

Due to the extremely large number of transactions that occurred during the POR and the resulting administrative burden involved in examining all of these transactions, we sampled sales to calculate NV in accordance with section 777A of the Act. When a firm had more than 2,000 home market sales transactions for a particular class or kind of merchandise, we used sales in sample months that corresponded to the sample weeks we selected for U.S. sales sampling plus one contemporaneous month prior to the POR and one following the POR. The sample months included April, May, August, October, and November of 1994, and January, March, and May of 1995.

We used sales to affiliated customers only where we determined such sales were made at arm's-length prices, *i.e.*, at prices comparable to prices at which the firm sold identical merchandise to unrelated customers.

Because the Department disregarded sales below the cost of production (COP) in the last completed review with respect to SNR, FAG Germany, FAG Italy, INA, SKF France, SKF Germany, SKF Italy, Asahi Seiko, Koyo, NPBS, NSK, NTN Japan, NMB Singapore/Pelmec Ind., and NSK/RHP and the classes or kinds of merchandise under review (see *AFBs IV;* concerning Asahi Seiko, see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al.; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation in Part of an Antidumping Duty Order,* 58 FR 39729 (July 26, 1993) (*AFBs III*)), we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign product under consideration for the determination of NV in this review may have been made at prices below the COP as provided by section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we initiated COP investigations of sales by SNR, FAG Germany, FAG Italy, INA, SKF France, SKF Germany, SKF Italy, Asahi Seiko, Koyo, NPBS, NSK, NTN Japan, NMB Singapore/Pelmec, and NSK/RHP in the home market.

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product plus selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses and all costs and expenses incidental to placing the foreign like product in condition packed ready for shipment. In our COP analysis, we used the home market sales and COP information provided by each respondent in its questionnaire responses. We did not conduct a COP analysis for respondents which reported no sales or no shipments, nor did we conduct a COP analysis for respondents for which we relied on facts available to determine weighted-average dumping margins.

After calculating COP, we tested whether home market sales of AFBs were made at prices below COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities and whether such prices permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We compared model-specific COPs to the reported home market prices less any applicable movement charges, discounts, and rebates.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because the below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time. Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POR were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because they (1) were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities in accordance with sections 773(b)(2) (B) and (C) of the Act, and (2) based on comparisons of prices to weighted-average COPs for the POR, were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Based on this test, we disregarded below-cost sales with respect to all of the above companies and classes or kinds of merchandise.

We compared U.S. sales with sales of the foreign like product in the home market. We considered all non-identical products within a bearing family to be equally similar. As defined in the questionnaire, a bearing family consists of all bearings within a class or kind of merchandise that are the same in the following physical characteristics: load direction, bearing design, number of rows of rolling elements, precision rating, dynamic load rating, outer diameter, inner diameter, and width.

Home market prices were based on the packed, ex-factory or delivered prices to affiliated or unaffiliated purchasers in the home market. Where applicable, we made adjustments for differences in packing and for movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6) (A) and (B) of the Act. We also made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and for differences in circumstances of sale

(COS) in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 C.F.R. 353.56. For comparison to EP, we made COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses and adding U.S. direct selling expenses. For comparisons to CEP, we made COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses and adding U.S. direct selling expenses except those deducted from the starting price in calculating CEP pursuant to section 772(d) of the Act. We also made adjustments, where applicable, for home market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in EP and CEP calculations.

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we based NV on sales at the same level of trade as the EP or CEP. If NV was calculated at a different level of trade, we made an adjustment, if appropriate and if possible, in accordance with section 773(a)(7) of the Act. (See *Level of Trade* below.)

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we used CV as the basis for NV when there were no usable sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market. We calculated CV in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials and fabrication, SG&A expenses, and profit. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by the respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses. To the extent possible, we calculated CV by level of trade, using the selling expenses and profit determined for each level of trade in the comparison market.

Where appropriate, we made adjustments to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act and 19 C.F.R. 353.56 for COS differences and level-of-trade differences. For comparisons to EP, we made COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses and adding U.S. direct selling expenses. For comparisons to CEP, we made COS adjustments by deducting home market direct selling expenses and adding U.S. direct selling expenses except those deducted from the starting price in calculating CEP pursuant to section 772(d) of the Act. We also made adjustments, where applicable, for home market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in EP and CEP comparisons.

Where possible, we calculated CV at the same level of trade as the EP or CEP. If CV was calculated at a different level of trade, we made an adjustment, if appropriate and if possible, in accordance with sections 773(a)(7) and 773(a)(8) of the Act. (See *Level of Trade* below.)

Level of Trade

As set forth in section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and in the SAA accompanying the URAA at 829–831, to the extent practicable, the Department will calculate NV based on sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales. When the Department is unable to find sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale, the Department may compare the U.S. sale to sales at a different level of trade in the comparison market.

In accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, if sales at allegedly different levels of trade are compared, the Department will adjust the NV to account for the difference in level of trade if two conditions are met. First, there must be differences between the actual selling activities performed by the exporter at the level of trade of the U.S. sale and the level of trade of the comparison market sales used to determine NV. Second, the differences must affect price comparability as evidenced by a pattern of consistent price differences between sales at the different levels of trade in the market in which NV is determined.

Section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act establishes that a CEP ''offset'' may be made when two conditions exist: (1) NV is established at a level of trade which constitutes a more advanced stage of distribution than the level of trade of the CEP; and (2) the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for a level-of-trade adjustment.

In implementing these principles in these reviews, we obtained information about the selling activities of the producers/exporters associated with each channel of distribution. We asked each respondent to establish any claimed levels of trade based on these selling activities.

In order to determine whether separate levels of trade actually existed within or between the U.S. and home markets, we reviewed the selling activities associated with each channel of distribution claimed by the respondents. Pursuant to section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act and the SAA at 827, in identifying levels of trade for EP and home market sales we considered the selling functions reflected in the starting price before any adjustments. For CEP sales, we considered only the selling activities reflected in the price after the deduction of expenses and profit under section 772(d) of the Act. Whenever sales were made by or through an affiliated company or agent, we considered all selling activities of both affiliated parties, except for those selling activities related to the expenses deducted under section 772(d) of the Act in CEP situations.

In reviewing the selling functions reported by the respondents, we considered all types of selling activities that had been performed. In analyzing whether separate levels of trade existed in these reviews, we found that no single selling function in the bearings industry was sufficient to warrant a separate level of trade (see *Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments*, 61 FR 7307, 7348 (February 27, 1996) (*Proposed Regulations*)).

In determining whether separate levels of trade existed in or between the U.S. and home markets, the Department considered the level-of-trade claims of each respondent. To test the claimed levels of trade, we analyzed the selling activities associated with the channels of distribution respondents reported. In applying this test, we expect that, if claimed levels of trade are the same, the functions and activities of the seller should be similar. Conversely, if a party claims that levels of trade are different for different groups of sales, the functions and activities of the seller should be dissimilar.

When we were unable to find sales of the foreign like product in the home market at the same level of trade as that of the EP or CEP, we examined whether a level-of-trade adjustment was appropriate. In these reviews, the same level of trade as that of the CEP did not exist in the home market. For some EP sales, we also did not find the same level of trade in the home market. Therefore, we could not determine whether there was a pattern of consistent price differences between the levels of trade, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, based on the respondent's home market sales of merchandise under review. However, the SAA states that ''if information on the same product and company is not available, the adjustment may also be based on sales of other products by the same company. In the absence of any sales, including those in recent time periods, to different levels of trade by the exporter or producer under investigation, Commerce may further consider the selling experience of other producers in the foreign market for the same product or other products.'' *SAA*

at 830. Accordingly, where necessary we examined the alternative methods for calculating a level-of-trade adjustment. In these reviews, we did not have information that would allow us to apply these alternative methods. Thus, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(b) of the Act, if we established NV at a level of trade which constituted a more advanced stage of distribution, we made a CEP offset.

For some EP sales, the same level of trade did exist in the home market but we could only match the U.S. sale to home market sales at a different level of trade because there were no usable sales of the foreign like product at the same level of trade. Therefore, we determined whether there was a pattern of consistent price differences between these different levels of trade in the home market. To make this determination, we compared the average of the prices of sales made in the ordinary course of trade at the two levels of trade for models sold at both levels. If the average prices were higher at one of the levels of trade for a preponderance of the models, we considered this to demonstrate a pattern of consistent price differences. We also considered whether the average prices were higher at one of the levels of trade for a preponderance of sales, based on the quantities of each model sold, in making this determination.

Respondent *Intertechnique* reported only one channel of distribution in the home market and only EP sales through one channel of distribution to the United States. Because the selling activities in both markets were substantially the same, we considered the home market sales and the EP sales to be at the same level of trade. Therefore, we made no level-of-trade adjustments.

SKF Germany, SKF France, SKF Italy, Koyo, and *SNR* each reported two channels of distribution in the home market. For each of these companies we found that the two home market channels differed significantly with respect to selling activities such as advertising and sales promotion, sales and marketing support, inventory maintenance and, to a lesser degree, other selling activities. Based on these differences, we found that the two home market channels constituted two different levels of trade.

These companies, except SKF France and SKF Italy, reported only CEP sales in the U.S. market. SKF France and SKF Italy also had EP sales. Although the starting price for the CEP sales was based on sales made by the affiliated reseller to unaffiliated customers through two channels of distribution which constituted two different levels of trade, each of these companies reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller (*i.e.,* at the level of trade of the CEP). Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade for each of these companies. We found that there were significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with each of the home market levels of trade. For example, the level of trade of the CEP involved little or no strategic planning, sales forecasting, advertising or sales promotions, engineering services, technical assistance, or after-sale service. Therefore, we considered the level of trade of the CEP to be different from either home market level of trade and a less advanced stage of distribution than either home market level of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on each respondent's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For these respondents, to the extent possible, we determined NV at the same level of trade as the starting price for the CEP, which was the price to the unaffiliated customer, and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. SKF France made EP sales of BBs through one channel of distribution. SKF Italy made EP sales of BBs through two channels of distribution. For both SKF France and SKF Italy, the selling activities associated with EP sales were similar to those associated with one of the levels of trade in the home market. Therefore, we considered these channels to constitute one level of trade and this level of trade to be the same as a level of trade in the home market. Where possible we matched EP sales to sales at the same level of trade in the home market and made no level-of-trade adjustment. Where we matched to home market sales at a different level of trade, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, we determined whether there was a pattern of consistent price differences between these different levels of trade in the home market. For this class or kind of merchandise, we found that there was such a pattern for both SKF France and SKF Italy and therefore made an adjustment for the differences in level of trade. We therefore adjusted normal value by the weighted-average difference in prices between the two levels of trade in the home market. We calculated the adjustment based on home market sales made in the ordinary course of trade and prices net of billing adjustments, movement expenses, discounts, rebates, commissions, direct selling expenses and packing expenses. For each model sold at both levels of trade in the home market, we calculated the difference between the weighted-average prices at the two levels of trade as a percentage of the weighted-average price at the comparison level of trade. We then calculated a weighted average of these model-specific percentage differences on a class-or-kind basis. We calculated the amount of the level-of-trade adjustment by applying this weighted-average percentage price difference to the NV determined at the different level of trade.

INA reported only one channel of distribution in the home market. Because the selling activities associated with all sales were similar, we considered this channel of distribution to constitute one level of trade. INA reported two channels of distribution in the U.S. market, one represented by its EP sales and one represented by its CEP sales. Because the selling activities associated with the home market level of trade were similar to those associated with EP sales, we made no level-of-trade adjustments for these comparisons. For CEP sales, INA reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We compared the selling activities associated with the sale to the affiliated reseller to those associated with the home market level of trade and found them to be dissimilar. For example, the level of trade of the CEP involved little or no strategic and economic planning, advertising or sales promotion, technical services, technical assistance, inventory maintenance or after-sale service. Therefore, we considered the home market sales to be at a different level of trade and at a more advanced stage of distribution than the CEP. Because the sole home market level of trade was different from the level of trade of the CEP, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on INA's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. Accordingly, for INA, we determined NV at the sole

home market level of trade and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

FAG Germany reported a number of channels of distribution in the home market. We found that four of these channels did not differ significantly with respect to selling activities and constitute one level of trade (level 1). We found that the same is true of three other home market channels (level 2). Finally, we found that another home market channel is not similar to any of the other channels of distribution in the home market (level 3). We found that level 1 differed significantly from level 2 with respect to selling activities such as post-sale services and warranties, technical advice, advertising, strategic and economic planning, market research, research and development, and engineering services. We found that level 1 differed significantly from level 3 with respect to selling activities such as inventory maintenance, advertising, freight and delivery arrangement, strategic and economic planning, market research, personnel training, research and development, and engineering services. We found that level 2 differed significantly from level 3 with respect to selling activities such as inventory maintenance, post-sale services and warranties, technical advice, freight and delivery arrangement, advertising, and personnel training. Based on these differences, we found that the three home market channel groups constitute three different levels of trade.

In the U.S. market, FAG Germany reported CEP sales and EP sales. The CEP sales were made by FAG Germany's U.S. subsidiary to unaffiliated customers through channels of distribution and at levels of trade similar to levels 1 and 2 in the home market. Although we considered FAG Germany's sales to unaffiliated customers to be made at two levels of trade, FAG Germany reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We found that there were significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with each of the home market levels of trade. For example, the level of trade of the CEP involved little or no strategic planning, sales forecasting, advertising or sales promotions, engineering services, technical assistance, or after-sale service. Therefore, we considered the level of trade of the CEP to be different from all home market levels of trade and at a less advanced stage of distribution than any home market level of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on FAG Germany's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For FAG Germany, to the extent possible, we determined NV for CEP sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. FAG Germany made EP sales of two classes or kinds of merchandise through channels of distribution similar to those comprising one of the levels of trade in the home market. Therefore, we considered these channels to constitute one level of trade and this level of trade to be the same as one of the levels of trade in the home market. Where possible we matched EP sales to sales at the same level of trade in the home market and made no level-of-trade adjustment. Where we matched to home market sales at a different level of trade, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, we determined whether there was a pattern of consistent price differences between these different levels of trade in the home market. For BBs, we found that there was such a pattern and therefore made an adjustment for the differences in level of trade. However, for CRBs we did not find such a pattern and therefore made no level-of-trade adjustment. For BBs, we adjusted normal value by the weighted-average difference in prices between the two levels of trade in the home market. We calculated the adjustment based on home market sales made in the ordinary course of trade and prices net of billing adjustments, movement expenses, discounts, rebates, commissions, direct selling expenses and packing expenses. For each model sold at both levels of trade in the home market, we calculated the difference between the weighted-average prices at the two levels of trade as a percentage of the weighted-average price at the comparison level of trade. We then calculated a weighted-average of these model-specific percentage differences on a class-or-kind basis. We calculated the amount of the level-of-trade adjustment by applying this weighted-average percentage price difference to the NV determined at the different level of trade.

FAG Italy reported two channels of distribution in the home market. We found that the two home market channels differed with respect to selling activities such as after sales services/warranties, technical advice, and research and development. Based on these differences, we found that the two home market channels constituted two different levels of trade.

In the U.S. market, FAG Italy reported only CEP sales. The CEP sales were made by FAG Italy's U.S. subsidiary to unaffiliated customers through channels of distribution and at levels of trade similar to the two levels of trade in the home market. Although we considered FAG Italy's sales to unaffiliated customers to be made at two levels of trade, FAG Italy reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We found that there were significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with each of the home market levels of trade. For example, the level of trade of the CEP involved little or no strategic planning, sales forecasting, advertising or sales promotions, engineering services, technical assistance, or after-sale service. Therefore, we considered the level of trade of the CEP to be different from either home market level of trade and at a less advanced stage of distribution than either home market level of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market, nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on FAG Italy's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For FAG Italy, to the extent possible, we determined NV at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

NSK reported four channels of distribution in the home market. We found that two of these channels did not differ significantly from each other with respect to selling activities and constitute one level of trade (level 1). We found that the same is true of the other two home market channels (level 2). We found that the selling activities associated with level 1 differed significantly from activities at level 2. For example, we found differences with respect to personnel training, advertising, technical support, price negotiation, and sales calls on the end-user. Based on these differences, we found that the two home market channel groups constituted two different levels of trade.

In the U.S. market, NSK had CEP sales and EP sales. NSK made CEP sales to unaffiliated customers through five channels of distribution, which we considered to be two levels of trade similar to those found in the home market. Though NSK's sales to unaffiliated customers were made at two levels of trade, NSK reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We found that there were significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with each of the home market levels of trade. For example, the level of trade of the CEP involved little or no strategic planning, sales forecasting, advertising or sales promotions, engineering services, technical assistance, or after-sale service. Therefore, we considered this level of trade to be different from either home market level of trade and at a less advanced stage of distribution than either home market level of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on NSK's home market sales of merchandise under to review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For NSK, to the extent possible, we determined NV for CEP sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B). NSK made EP sales of one class or kind of merchandise to unaffiliated customers through channels of distribution similar to those comprising channel 1 in the home market. Therefore, we considered these channels to constitute one level of trade and that level of trade to be the same as level 1 in the home market. Where possible we have matched EP sales to sales at the same level of trade in the home market and made no level-of-trade adjustment. Where we matched EP sales to home market sales at a different level of trade, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, we determined whether there was a pattern of consistent price differences between these different levels of trade in the home market. For this class or kind of merchandise, we found that there was such a pattern and therefore made an adjustment for the differences in level of trade. We adjusted normal value by the weighted-average difference in prices between the two levels of trade in the home market. We calculated the adjustment based on home market sales made in the ordinary course of trade and prices net of billing adjustments, movement expenses, discounts, rebates, commissions, direct selling expenses and packing expenses. For each model sold at both levels of trade in the home market, we calculated the difference between the weighted-average prices at the two levels of trade as a percentage of the weighted-average price at the comparison level of trade. We then calculated a weighted-average of these model-specific percentage differences on a class-or-kind basis. We calculated the amount of the level-of-trade adjustment by applying this weighted-average percentage price difference to the NV determined at the different level of trade.

NTN Japan reported five channels of distribution in the home market. We found that the degree to which NTN Japan performed functions such as market research, technical services, and sales services such as processing and purchasing arrangements and delivery arrangements varied among the five channels. Based on these differences, we found that the five home market channels constituted three levels of trade. We found that the selling activities for level 1 differed significantly from levels 2 and 3 in terms of strategic economic planning, market research, accounting and business functions, engineering services, types of packing, and types of advertising and sales promotion. The selling activities for level 2 varied from those of level 3 in strategic and economic planning, accounting and business functions, and advertising and sales promotion.

NTN Japan reported both EP and CEP sales in the U.S. market made through two channels of distribution. NTN Japan made CEP sales through its U.S. subsidiary to unaffiliated customers through channels of distribution similar to those in the home market. Though these sales to unaffiliated customers were made at two levels of trade, NTN Japan reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We found that there were significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with each of the home market levels of trade. For example, at the level of trade of the CEP there was little or no strategic planning, sales forecasting, advertising, or technical assistance. Therefore, we considered this level of trade to be different from the three home market levels of trade and at a less advanced stage of distribution than the home market levels of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on the respondent's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For this respondent, to the extent possible, we determined NV at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. We considered all of NTN Japan's EP sales to be at one level of trade. We determined that the selling activities associated with EP sales were essentially the same as those associated with one of the home market levels of trade, and therefore the EP level of trade did exist in the home market. Therefore, where possible we matched EP sales to sales at the same level of trade in the home market and made no level-of-trade adjustment. Where we matched to home market sales at a different level of trade, in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act, we determined whether there was a pattern of consistent price differences between these different levels of trade in the home market. For BBs and CRBs, we found that there was such a pattern and therefore made an adjustment for the differences in level of trade. However, for SPBs we did not find such a pattern and therefore made no level-of-trade adjustment. For BBs and CRBs, we adjusted NV by the weighted-average difference in prices between the two levels of trade in the home market. We calculated the adjustment based on home market sales made in the ordinary course of trade and prices net of billing adjustments, movement expenses, discounts, rebates, commissions, direct selling expenses and packing expenses. For each model sold at both levels of trade in the home market, we calculated the difference between the weighted-average prices at the two levels of trade as a percentage of the weighted-average price at the comparison level of trade. We then calculated a weighted average of these model-specific percentage differences on a class-or-kind basis. We calculated the amount of the level-of-trade adjustment by applying this weighted-average percentage price difference to the NV determined at the different level of trade.

NTN Germany claimed one channel of distribution but two levels of trade in

the home market. We found that the degree to which NTN Germany performed functions such as after sales services, market research, technical services, and sales services such as processing and purchasing arrangements differed by claimed levels of trade. Based on these differences, we found that these claimed levels of trade in fact constitute two levels of trade in the home market.

NTN Germany reported only CEP sales in the U.S. market. Though CEP sales to unaffiliated customers were made at two levels of trade, NTN Germany reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We found that there were significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with each of the home market levels of trade. For example, at the level of trade of the CEP there was little or no strategic planning, sales forecasting, advertising, or technical assistance. Therefore, we considered this level of trade to be different from the home market levels of trade and at a less advanced stage of distribution than the home market levels of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on the respondent's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For this respondent, to the extent possible, we determined NV at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

NMB Singapore/Pelmec reported two channels of distribution in the home market. We found that these two channels differed significantly with respect to selling activities such as after-sales services/warranties, technical support, engineering services, market research, sales promotion, and advertising. Based on these differences, we found that the two home market channels constituted two different levels of trade.

NMB Singapore/Pelmec reported only CEP sales in the U.S. market. Though sales were made to unaffiliated customers through two channels of distribution, the company reported similar selling activities associated with all sales to the affiliated reseller. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We found that there were significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with each of the home market levels of trade. For example, the level of trade of the CEP only involved order processing and some engineering consultation. This level did not include any of the other selling activities associated with either of the home market levels of trade such as inventory maintenance, after-sales services/warranties, technical support, market research, sales promotion, advertising, freight and delivery, packing and accounting. Therefore, we considered the level of trade of the CEP to be different from either home market level of trade and at a less advanced stage of distribution than either home market level of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on the respondent's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For this respondent, to the extent possible, we determined NV at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

Asahi Seiko reported seven channels of distribution in the home market and CEP sales through four channels of distribution in the U.S. market. In comparing selling activities among channels of distribution in the home market, we found that no promotional expenses, sales-support functions, or inventory maintenance activities were performed for the channel of distribution consisting of direct sales to Asahi's affiliated customer while these functions were performed with respect to the other six channels. In addition, the selling activities were substantially the same among the other six channels. Therefore, we found that the seven HM channels constitute two different levels of trade. However, we are not using the level of trade consisting of direct sales to Asahi's affiliated customer as a basis for NV because we could not determine that these sales were made at arm's-length prices. Thus, for NV we could use only one level of trade for comparison purposes.

In the U.S. market Asahi Seiko reported that the CEP sales it made to unaffiliated customers were through four channels of distribution, but the selling activities among all sales to the affiliated reseller were similar. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We found significant differences between the selling activities associated with the CEP and those associated with the home market level of trade. For example, the level of trade of the CEP involved little or no advertising and sales promotions, engineering services, or after-sales service. Therefore, we considered this level of trade to be different from and at a less advanced stage of distribution than the home market level of trade. Consequently, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on Asahi's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For Asahi Seiko, to the extent possible, we determined NV at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act.

NSK/RHP reported five channels of distribution in the home market. The selling activities associated with three of these reported channels did not differ significantly, and therefore we considered sales through these channels to constitute one level of trade (level 1). The selling activities associated with another channel of distribution differed from level 1 in terms of advertising, inventory maintenance, technical support and to a lesser degree other selling activities. Therefore, we consider this channel of distribution to constitute a second level of trade (level 2). The remaining channel of distribution involved only sales to an affiliate. However, we requested, and NSK/RHP reported, the downstream sales to unaffiliated customers which constitute levels 1 and 2. Moreover, we could not determine that these sales were made at arm's length. Therefore, we did not use these sales to determine NV or as the basis of any level-of-trade adjustments.

In the U.S. market, NSK/RHP reported EP and CEP sales. Although NSK/RHP reported that the CEP sales it made to unaffiliated customers were made through two channels of distribution, the selling activities among all sales to the affiliated reseller were similar. Therefore, we considered the CEP to constitute only one level of trade. We compared the selling activities at this level of trade with the selling activities at each home market level of trade and found them to be substantially dissimilar. For example, the level of trade of the CEP involved little or no strategic and economic planning,

advertising or sales promotion, technical services, technical assistance, or inventory maintenance. Therefore, we considered the home market sales to be at a different level of trade and at a more advanced stage of distribution than CEP. Because the home market levels of trade were different from the level of trade of the CEP, we could not match to sales at the same level of trade in the home market nor could we determine a level-of-trade adjustment based on NSK-RHP's home market sales of merchandise under review. Furthermore, we have no other information that provides an appropriate basis for determining a level-of-trade adjustment. For NSK-RHP's CEP sales, to the extent possible, we determined NV at the same level of trade as the U.S. sale to the unaffiliated customer and made a CEP offset adjustment in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act. NSK/RHP made EP sales of two classes or kinds of merchandise to unaffiliated customers through one channel of distribution which we considered to be a level of trade similar to one of the levels of trade in the home market. We were able to match all EP sales to sales at the same level of trade in the home market and therefore made no level-of-trade adjustments.

Preliminary Results of Reviews

As a result of our reviews, we preliminarily determine the weighted-average dumping margins (in percent) for the period May 1, 1994, through April 30, 1995 to be as follows:

Company	BBs	CRBs	SPBs
France			
Franke GmbH	[1] 66.42	([3])	([3])
Hoesch Rothe Erde	([2])	([3])	([3])
Intertechnique	1.55	([2])	([2])
Rollix Defontaine	([2])	([3])	([3])
SKF	21.39	([2])	42.79
SNFA	66.42	18.37	([2])
SNR	2.10	4.26	([2])
Germany			
FAG	10.22	16.90	9.51
Franke GmbH	[1] 132.25	([3])	([3])
Hoesch Rothe Erde	([2])	([2])	([2])
INA	11.66	12.33	([2])
NTN	23.37	([2])	([2])
Rollix & Defontaine	([2])	([3])	([3])
SKF	2.42	8.11	5.34
Torrington Nadellager	([2])	76.27	([3])
Italy			
FAG	2.43	([2])	([3])
SKF	2.68	([3])	([3])
Japan			
Asahi Seiko	1.96	([3])	([3])
Koyo Seiko	22.32	2.79	0.00 [1]
NPBS	45.83	([2])	([2])
NSK Ltd.	14.24	18.27	([2])
NTN	4.31	10.27	2.60
Singapore			
NMB Singapore/ Pelmec Ind.	0.71	([3])	([3])
United Kingdom			
NSK/RHP	9.60	11.13	([3])
Hoffman U.K.	54.27	48.29	([3])
Rose Bearings	54.27	48.29	([3])
Timken Bearings	([2])	([2])	([3])

[1] No shipments or sales subject to this review. Rate is from the last relevant segment of the proceeding in which the firm had shipments/sales.

[2] No shipments or sales subject to this review. The firm has no individual rate from any segment of this proceeding.

[3] No review requested.

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of the date of publication of this notice. A general issues hearing, if requested, and any hearings regarding issues related solely to specific countries, if requested, will be held in accordance with the following schedule and at the indicated locations in the main Commerce Department building:

Case	Date	Time	Room No.
General Issues	Aug. 16, 1996	9:00 a.m	4830
Singapore	Aug. 16, 1996	3:00 p.m	4830
United Kingdom	Aug. 19, 1996	10:00 a.m	1412
Japan	Aug. 19, 1996	1:00 p.m	1412
Germany	Aug. 20, 1996	10:00 a.m	1412
France	Aug. 20, 1996	1:00 p.m	1412

Issues raised in hearings will be limited to those raised in the respective briefs and rebuttal briefs. Briefs from interested parties and rebuttal briefs, limited to the issues raised in the respective case briefs, may be submitted not later than the dates shown below for general issues and the respective country-specific cases. Parties who submit briefs or rebuttal briefs in these proceedings are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

Case	Briefs	Rebuttals due
General issues.	Aug. 5, 1996	Aug. 12, 1996.
Singapore	Aug. 5, 1996	Aug. 12, 1996.
U.K.	Aug. 6, 1996	Aug. 13, 1996.
Japan	Aug. 6, 1996	Aug. 13, 1996.
Germany	Aug. 7, 1996	Aug. 14, 1996.
France	Aug. 7, 1996	Aug. 14, 1996.

The Department will subsequently publish the final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs or hearings. The Department will issue final results of these reviews within 180 days of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Because sampling and the inability to link sales with specific entries prevents calculation of duties on an entry-by-entry basis, we have calculated an importer-specific *ad valorem* duty assessment rate for each class or kind of merchandise based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales made during the POR to the total customs value of the sales used to calculate those duties. This rate will be assessed uniformly on all entries of that particular importer made during the POR. (This is equivalent to dividing the total amount of antidumping duties, which are calculated by taking the difference between statutory NV and statutory EP or CEP, by the total statutory EP or CEP value of the sales compared, and adjusting the result by the average difference between EP or CEP and customs value for all merchandise examined during the POR.)

In some cases, such as EP situations, the respondent does not know the

entered value of the merchandise. For these situations, we have either calculated an approximate entered value or an average unit dollar amount of antidumping duty based on all sales examined during the POR. (See *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from the Federal Republic of Germany; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 56 FR 31694 (July 11, 1991).) The Department will issue appropriate appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service upon completion of these reviews.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of these administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be those rates established in the final results of these reviews (except that no deposit will be required for firms with zero or *de minimis* margins, *i.e.,* margins less than 0.5 percent); (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the ''all others'' rate made effective by the final results of the 1991–92 administrative reviews of these orders (see *AFBs III*). As noted in those previous final results, these rates are the ''all others'' rates from the relevant LTFV investigations. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

These administrative reviews and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22(c)(5).

Dated: June 27, 1996.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96–17277 Filed 7–5–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[A–583–810]

Chrome-Plated Lug Nuts From Taiwan; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Termination in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Termination in Part.

SUMMARY: In response to a request by the petitioner, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on chromeplated lug nuts from Taiwan. The review covers 19 manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States for the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995. The review indicates the existence of margins for all firms.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between export price and the NV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument are requested to submit with each argument (1) and statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 8, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas Futtner, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4195 or 482–3814, respectively.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations, as amended by the interim regulations published in the Federal Register on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On September 20, 1991, the Department published the antidumping duty order on chrome-plated lug nuts from Taiwan (56 FR 47736). The Department published a notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' on September 12, 1995 (60 FR 47349). The petitioner, Consolidated International Automotive, Inc. (Consolidated), requested that we conduct an administrative review for the period September 1, 1994, through August 31, 1995. A respondent, Chuen Chao Enterprise Company LTD (Chuen Chao) requested an administrative review of its sales. We published a notice of ''Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Review'' on October 12, 1995 (60 FR 53164), and sent questionnaires to the following firms: Anmax Industrial Co., Ltd. (Anmax), Buxton International Corporation (Buxton), Chu Fong Metallic Electric Co. (Chu Fong), Everspring Plastic Corp. (Everspring), Gingen Metal Corp. (Gingen), Goldwinate Associates, Inc. (Goldwinate), Gourmet Equipment Corporation (Gourmet), Hwen Hsin Enterprises Co., Ltd. (Hwen), Kwan How Enterprises Co., Ltd. (Kwan How), Kwan Ta Enterprises Co. Ltd (Kwan Ta), Kuang Hong Industries, Ltd. (Kuang), Multigrand Industries Inc. (Multigrand), San Chien Electric Industrial Works, Ltd. (San Chien), San Shing Hardware Works Co., Ltd. (San Shing), Transcend International Co. (Transcend), Trade Union International Inc./Top Line (Top Line), Uniauto, Inc. (Uniauto), Wing Tang Electrical Manufacturing Company, Inc (Wing) and Chuen Chao. On December 11, 1995, Chuen Chao withdrew its request for administrative review. Since Chuen Chao was the only party which requested a review of its sales, we are terminating the review of Chuen Chao and its entries will be liquidated at the rate at which they were entered. Gourmet responded to the questionnaire. Buxton and Uniauto are related parties and so responded to the questionnaire as one respondent.

Questionnaires that were sent to Chu Fong, Kwan How, Kwan Ta, Everspring, Gingen, Goldwinate, Multigrand and Kuang were returned as undeliverable. These firms will receive the ''all others''