ordinary course of trade, for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average home market selling expenses.

Currency Conversion

For purposes of the preliminary results, we made currency conversions based on the official exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Section 773A(a) of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, unless the daily rate involves a ''fluctuation.'' In accordance with the Department's practice, we have determined as a general matter that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the rolling average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation exists, we substitute the benchmark for the daily rate.

Preliminary Results of the Review

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists:

Manufacturer/exporter	Period	Margin (percent)
Mannesmannroehren-Werke AG	1/27/95–7/31/96	28.69

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs from interested parties may be submitted not later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in those briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including its analysis of issues raised in the case and rebuttal briefs, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

The following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this antidumping duty review for all shipments of small diameter circular seamless carbon and alloy steel standard, line and pressure pipe, entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided by section 751(a) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed company will be that established in the final results of review; (2) for exporters not covered in this review, but covered in the LTFV investigation or previous review, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate from the LTFV investigation; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a previous 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; (4) the cash deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 57.72 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the LTFV investigation. These requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice 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.

This administrative review and notice are published in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: September 2, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–23856 Filed 9–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–054, A–588–604]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews.

SUMMARY: In response to requests by the petitioner and one respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings (TRBs) and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from Japan (A–588–604), and of the antidumping finding on TRBs, four inches or less in outside diameter, and components thereof, from Japan (A–588–054). The review of the A–588–054 finding covers two manufacturers/exporters and two resellers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996. The review of the A–588–604 order covers three manufacturers/exporters and two resellers/exporters, and the period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996.

We preliminarily determine that sales of TRBs have been made below the normal value (NV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative reviews, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between United States price and the NV. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issues and (2) A brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 9, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Ranado, Stephanie Arthur, or Valerie Owenby, AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3518, 6312, or 0145, respectively.

APPLICABLE STATUTE AND REGULATIONS: 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. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations are to the Department's regulations, 19 CFR part 353 (1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 18, 1976, the Treasury Department published in the **Federal Register** (41 FR 34974) the antidumping finding on TRBs from Japan, and on October 6, 1987, the Department published the antidumping duty order on TRBs from Japan (52 FR 37352). On October 1, 1996, the Department published the notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' for both TRBs cases covering the period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996 (61 FR 51529).

In accordance with 19 CFR 353.22 (a)(1), on October 31, 1996, the petitioner, the Timken Company (Timken), requested that we conduct a review of Fuji Heavy Industries (Fuji), Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd. (Koyo), MC International (MC), and NSK Ltd. (NSK) in both the A–588–054 and A–588–604 cases. In addition, Timken requested that we conduct a review of NTN Corporation (NTN) in the A–588–604 TRBs case. On October 28, 1996, NSK requested that we conduct a review of its sales in both TRBs cases. On November 15, 1996, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of these antidumping duty administrative reviews covering the period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996 (61 FR 58513).

Because it was not practicable to complete these reviews within the normal time frame, on March 5, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** our notice of the extension of the time limits for both the A–588–054 and A–588–604 1994–95 reviews (62 FR 10025). As a result of this extension, we extended the deadline for these preliminary results to September 2, 1997.

Scope of the Reviews

Imports covered by the A–588–054 finding are sales or entries of TRBs, four inches or less in outside diameter when assembled, including inner race or cone assemblies and outer races or cups, sold either as a unit or separately. This merchandise is classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) item numbers 8482.20.00 and 8482.99.30.

Imports covered by the A–588–604 order include TRBs and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, which are flange, take-up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating TRBs, and roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for automotive use. Products subject to the A–588–054 finding are not included within the scope of the A–588–604 order, except those manufactured by NTN. This merchandise is currently classifiable under HTS item numbers 8482.99.30, 8483.20.40, 8482.20.20, 8483.20.80, 8482.91.00, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, and 8483.90.60. The HTS item numbers listed above for both the A–588–054 finding and the A–588–604 order are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written descriptions remain dispositive.

The period for each review is October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996. The review of the A–588–054 finding covers TRBs sales by two manufacturers/exporters (Koyo and NSK) and two resellers/exporters (Fuji and MC). The review of the A–588–604 order covers TRBs sales by three manufacturers/exporters (Koyo, NTN, and NSK) and two resellers/exporters (Fuji and MC).

No Shipments

Fuji and MC made no shipments of A–588–604 merchandise during the period of review (POR). In addition, neither Fuji nor MC was a party to the A–588–604 less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation and neither of these firms has been assigned rates from any prior segment of this proceeding. Because Fuji's and MC's shipments have never been reviewed individually, we have not assigned a rate to either firm for the A–588–604 case. If Fuji or MC begins shipping merchandise subject to the A–588–604 order at some future date, the entries will be subject to cash deposit rates attributable to the manufacturer(s) of the subject merchandise.

Duty Absorption

On December 11, 1996, Timken requested that the Department determine, with respect to all respondents, whether antidumping duties had been absorbed during the POR. Section 751(a)(4) of the Act provides for the Department, if requested, to determine during an administrative review initiated two or four years after the publication of the order, whether antidumping duties have been absorbed by a foreign producer or exporter. The Department's interim regulations do not address this provision of the Tariff Act.

For transition orders as defined in section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Tariff Act, *i.e.*, orders in effect as of January 1, 1995, § 351.213(j)(2) of the Department's new antidumping regulations provides that the Department will make a duty-absorption determination, if requested, for any administrative review initiated in 1996 or 1998. *See* 62 FR 27394 (May 19, 1997). Because the finding and order on TRBs have been in effect since 1976 and 1987, respectively, they are transition orders in accordance with section 751(c)(6)(C) of the Tariff Act. (*See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et. al.; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 31568 (June 10, 1997*). The preamble to the new antidumping regulations explains that reviews initiated in 1996 will be considered initiated in the second year and reviews initiated in 1998 will be considered initiated in the fourth year (62 FR 27317, May 19, 1997). This approach ensures that interested parties will have the opportunity to request a duty-absorption determination prior to the time for sunset review of the order under section 751(c) of the Act on entries for which the second and fourth years following an order have already passed. Since these reviews were initiated in 1996, and a request was made for a determination, we are making duty-absorption determinations as part of these administrative reviews.

The statute provides for a determination on duty absorption if the subject merchandise is sold in the United States through an affiliated importer. In these cases, NTN, Koyo, NSK, and Fuji sold through importers that are affiliated within the meaning of section 751(a)(4) of the Act. Furthermore, we have preliminarily determined that each firm listed below has margins on the noted percentage of its U.S. sales:

Manufacturer/Exporter/Reseller	Percentage of U.S. affiliates' sales with dumping margins
For the A–588–054 Case:	
Koyo Seiko	13.11
Fuji	4.45
NSK	22.76
For the A–588–604 Case:	
Koyo Seiko	97.26
Fuji [1]	.....
NSK	56.33
NTN	64.47

[1] No shipments or sales subject to this review.

In the case of Koyo, the firm did not respond to our request for further-manufacturing information and we determined the dumping margins for these further-manufactured sales on the

basis of adverse facts available. Lacking other information, we find duty absorption on all such sales of further-processed TRBs. (*See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et. al.; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 31568 (June 10, 1997)*.) Where Koyo's margins were not determined on the basis of adverse facts available (*i.e.*, for non-further-manufactured sales), we must presume that duties will be absorbed for those sales which were dumped.

With respect to other respondents with affiliated importers (NSK, NTN, and Fuji), for which we did not apply adverse facts available, we must presume that the duties will be absorbed for those sales which were dumped. (*See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et. al.; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 31568 (June 10, 1997)*.) Our duty-absorption presumptions can be rebutted with evidence that the unaffiliated purchasers in the United States will pay the ultimately assessed duty. However, there is no such evidence on the record. Under these circumstances, we preliminarily find that antidumping duties have been absorbed by Koyo, NTN, NSK, and Fuji on the percentages of U.S. sales indicated. If interested parties wish to submit evidence that the unaffiliated purchasers in the United States will pay the ultimately assessed duties, they must do so no later than 15 days after publication of these preliminary results.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Tariff 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

In accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, in these preliminary results we have found it necessary to use partial facts available in those instances where a respondent did not provide us with certain information necessary to conduct our analysis. This occurred with respect to certain model-match and constructed value (CV) information omitted from MC's response and certain sales and cost information Koyo declined to report for its sales of U.S. further-manufactured merchandise subject to the A–588–604 order.

MC's questionnaire response contained only limited model match information, which prevented us from finding contemporaneous sales of the foreign like product for comparison to a small number of U.S. sales of subject merchandise. As a result of MC's failure to provide certain information necessary for our determination, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, we have resorted to facts available. Because MC was not afforded the opportunity to remedy or explain its deficiencies in accordance with section 782(d) of the Act, for these preliminary results, as partial facts available, we have applied to each unmatched U.S. sale a percentage dumping margin equal to the overall weighted-average percentage margin we calculated for those U.S. transactions reported by MC for which we were able to calculate a margin. However, for our final results, we will provide MC with an opportunity to remedy or explain its deficiencies in accordance with section 782(d) of the Act.

On January 28, 1997, Koyo wrote to the Department requesting a determination that it not be required to submit a response to Section E of our questionnaire regarding its U.S. further-manufactured sales. We informed Koyo in a letter dated February 18, 1997, that it was not required at that time to supply further-manufacturing data, but that we may require such information at a later date based on additional analysis of the company's response. After further review of Koyo's response, we concluded that we would require more information concerning its U.S. further-manufactured sales, and notified Koyo on April 10, 1997, that we required a response to Section E of our questionnaire by May 1, 1997. In response to Koyo's April 29, 1997, request, we subsequently extended the response deadline until June 9, 1997. However, Koyo telephonically notified us on June 9 and in a letter dated June 10, 1997, that it would not file a further-manufacturing response. As a result of Koyo's refusal to file a further-manufacturing response, the Department lacks data necessary for its analysis. Therefore, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, we resorted to the use of facts otherwise available in the absence of the necessary further-manufacturing data Koyo failed to provide. The Department is authorized, under section 776(b) of the Act, to use an inference that is adverse to the interest of a party if we find that the party has failed to cooperate by not acting to the best of its ability to comply with our request for information. By refusing our information request, Koyo failed to act to the best of its ability in declining to provide the data we requested. As a result, in accordance with section 776(b) of the Act, we determined that it is appropriate to make an adverse inference with respect to Koyo, and have used the highest rate calculated for Koyo in any prior segment of the A–588–604 proceeding as partial adverse facts available, which is 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 used as facts available 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 used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for margins is administrative determinations. Thus, in an administrative review, if the Department chooses as 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 irrelevant. 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 Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 49567 (February 22, 1996), where we disregarded the highest margin in the case as best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an extremely high margin).

For these preliminary results, we have examined the history of the A–588–604 case and have determined that 36.21 percent, the rate we calculated for Koyo in the less-than-fair-value

determination, is the highest calculated rate for Koyo in any prior segment of the A–588–604 order (*see Amendment to Final Determination of Sales At Less Than Fair Value and Amendment to Antidumping Duty Order; Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from Japan,* 52 FR 47955 (December 17, 1987)). In addition, we have examined the circumstances surrounding the calculation of this rate and have determined that there is no reliable evidence on the records for the reviews in which this rate was calculated which indicates that this margin is irrelevant or inappropriate. As a result, for these preliminary results we have applied, as adverse facts available, a margin of 36.21 percent to Koyo's further-manufactured U.S. sales.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

Because all of Koyo's and NSK's sales and certain of Fuji's and NTN's sales of subject merchandise were first sold to unaffiliated purchasers after importation into the United States, in calculating U.S. price we used constructed export price (CEP) for all of Koyo's and NSK's sales and certain of Fuji's and NTN's sales, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act. We based CEP on the packed, delivered price to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts, billing adjustments, freight allowances, and rebates. Pursuant to section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, we reduced this price for movement expenses (Japanese pre-sale inland freight, Japanese post-sale inland freight, international air and/or ocean freight, marine insurance, Japanese brokerage and handling, U.S. inland freight from the port to the warehouse, U.S. inland freight from the warehouse to the customer, U.S. duty, and U.S. brokerage and handling). We also reduced the price, where applicable, by an amount for the following expenses incurred in the selling of the merchandise in the United States pursuant to section 772(d)(1): Commissions to unaffiliated parties, U.S. credit, payments to third parties, U.S. repacking expenses, and indirect selling expenses (which included, where applicable, inventory carrying costs, indirect warehouse expenses, indirect advertising expenses, indirect technical services expenses, pre-sale warehousing expenses, and other U.S.-incurred indirect selling expenses). Finally, pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, we further reduced U.S. price by an amount for profit to arrive at CEP.

Koyo originally claimed an offsetting adjustment to its U.S. indirect selling expenses for interest incurred when financing cash deposits, but during verification retracted its claim. NTN also claimed an offsetting adjustment to U.S. indirect selling expenses to account for the cost of financing cash deposits during the POR. In past reviews we have accepted such an adjustment, mainly to account for the opportunity cost associated with making a deposit (i.e., the cost of having money unavailable for a period of time). However, we have preliminarily determined to change our practice of accepting such an adjustment.

We are not convinced that there are such opportunity costs associated with paying deposits. Moreover, while it may be true that importers sometimes incur an expense if they borrow money in order to pay antidumping duty cash deposits, it is a fundamental principle that money is fungible. If an importer acquires a loan to cover one operating cost, that may simply mean that it will not be necessary to borrow money to cover a different operating cost. We find that the calculation of the dumping margin should not vary depending on whether a party has funds available to pay cash deposits or requires additional funds in the form of loans.

Therefore, we find that an adjustment to indirect selling expenses where parties have claimed financing costs is inappropriate and we have denied such adjustments for the preliminary results of these reviews (*see Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et. al.; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 31568 (June 10, 1997)).*

Because certain of Fuji's and NTN's sales of subject merchandise, and all of MC's sales of subject merchandise, were made to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States and the constructed export price methodology was not indicated by the facts of record, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, we used export price (EP) for these sales. We calculated EP as the packed, delivered price to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, we reduced this price, where applicable, by Japanese pre-sale inland freight, Japanese post-sale inland freight, international air and/or ocean freight, marine insurance, Japanese brokerage and handling, U.S. brokerage and handling, U.S. duty, and U.S. inland freight.

Where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act, the Department also deducts from CEP the cost of any further manufacture or assembly in the United States, except where the special rule provided in section 772(e) of the Act is applied. 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 CEP. *See* Sections 772(e)(1) and (2) of the Act.

In judging whether the use of identical or other subject merchandise is appropriate, the Department must consider several factors, including whether it is more appropriate to use another ''reasonable basis.'' Under some circumstances, we may use the standard methodology as a reasonable alternative to the methods described in paragraphs 772(e)(1) and (2) of the Act. In deciding whether it is more appropriate to use the standard methodology we have considered and weighed the burden to the Department of applying the standard methodology as a reasonable alternative and the extent to which application of the standard methodology will lead to more accurate results. The burden of using the standard methodology may vary from case to case depending on factors such as the nature of the further-manufacturing process and the finished products. The increased accuracy gained by applying the standard methodology will vary significantly from case to case, depending upon such factors as the amount of value added in the United States and the proportion of total U.S. sales that involve further manufacturing. In cases where the burden is high, it is more likely that the Department will determine that potential gains in accuracy do not outweigh the burden of applying the standard methodology. Thus, the Department will likely determine that application of the standard methodology is not more appropriate than application of paragraphs 772(e)(1) and (2), or some other reasonable alternative methodology. By contrast, if the burden is relatively low and there is reason to believe the standard methodology is

likely to be more accurate, the Department is more likely to determine that it is not appropriate to apply the methods described in paragraphs 772(e)(1) or (2) in lieu of the standard methodology.

Fuji's two U.S. affiliates, Subaru of America (SOA) and Subaru-Isuzu Automotive (SIA), both imported TRBs into the United States which were first purchased by Fuji from Japanese producers in Japan. While SOA imported TRBs during the review period for the sole purpose of reselling the bearings as replacement parts for Subaru automobiles in the United States, SIA imported TRBs for the sole purpose of using them in its production of Subaru automobiles in the United States, the final product sold by SIA to the first unaffiliated customer in the United States

To determine whether the value added in the United States by SIA is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise, we estimated the value added based on the differences between the averages of the prices charged to the first unaffiliated U.S. customer for the final merchandise sold (the automobiles) and the averages of the prices paid for the subject merchandise (the imported TRBs) by the affiliated party. Based on this analysis and information on the record, we determined that the value of the TRBs further processed by SIA in the United States was a minuscule amount of the price charged by SIA to the first unaffiliated customer for the automobiles it sold in the United States. Therefore, we determined that the value added is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise.

Next, we examined whether sales of non-further-manufactured merchandise were made in sufficient quantity. They were. Finally, we considered whether it would be appropriate to apply alternatives provided in paragraphs 772(e) (1) and (2) of the Act with respect to those TRBs imported by SIA. As indicated above, because SIA further manufactures TRBs into finished automobiles, the value of the imported TRBs is a miniscule amount of the price SIA charges for the finished automobile and, therefore, also a miniscule amount of the value added by SIA to the imported TRBs. In light of this, a calculation of the dumping margins for TRBs imported by SIA using our standard methodology would require the actual calculation of the enormous value added by SIA and the deduction of these costs, plus an apportioned profit, from the price charged by SIA for a finished automobile. Not only would such a calculation be overwhelmingly burdensome to the Department, but the extent and complexity of the calculation would most likely generate inaccurate results. The legislative history of the URAA and the SAA make it clear that the special rule provision is intended to reduce just such a burden on the Department. Given this, along with the relatively low proportion of Fuji's further-manufactured U.S. merchandise to its non-further-manufactured U.S. merchandise, we have preliminarily determined that it is appropriate to apply the alternatives under paragraphs 772(e)(1) and (2) with respect to SIA's imports of TRBs. Therefore, in accordance with section 772(e) of the Act, for the purpose of determining dumping margins for the TRBs entered by SIA and used in the production of automobiles, we have used the weighted-average dumping margins we calculated on sales of identical or other subject merchandise sold by SOA as replacement TRBs to unaffiliated persons in the United States.

NTN and Koyo also imported subject merchandise (TRBs parts) which was further processed in the United States. However, both companies further manufactured the imported scope merchandise into merchandise of the same class or kind as merchandise within the scope of the A–588–604 order and A–588–054 finding (finished TRBs). Based on information provided by both firms, we first determined whether the value added in the United States was likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise. We estimated the value added based on the differences between the averages of the prices charged to the first unaffiliated U.S. customer for the final merchandise sold (finished TRBs) and the averages of the prices paid for the subject merchandise (imported TRBs parts) by the affiliated party and determined that, for both firms, the value added was likely to exceed substantially the value of the imported TRBS parts.

We then examined whether it would be appropriate to use sales of non-further-manufactured merchandise as a basis for comparison, under paragraphs 772(e)(1) and (2) of the Act, with respect to NTN's and Koyo's imported TRBs parts. In contrast to Fuji, the finished merchandise sold by NTN and Koyo to the first unrelated U.S. customer was of the same class or kind as merchandise within the scope of the TRBS order and finding. Moreover, the Department has experience in calculating dumping margins for Koyo's and NTN's further-manufactured TRBs numerous times in past reviews using our standard methodology. These facts indicate that the use of the standard calculation with respect to NTN or Koyo would not be unduly burdensome to the Department. However, based on the information provided by NTN, we determined that the proportion of its further-manufactured merchandise to its total imports of subject merchandise was relatively low. Therefore, we have preliminarily determined that, in NTN's case, any potential gains in accuracy from examining NTN's further-manufactured sales are outweighed by the burden of the applying the standard methodology and that it would be appropriate to apply one of the methodologies specified in the statute with respect to NTN's imported TRBS parts. Furthermore, other sales are in sufficient quantity. Therefore, for the purpose of determining dumping margins for NTN's imported TRBs which were further manufactured in the United States prior to resale, we have used the weighted-average dumping margins we calculated on NTN's sales of non-further-manufactured TRBs.

In contrast to NTN, information on the record establishes that Koyo's imported and further-manufactured merchandise is a relatively high proportion of its total imports of subject merchandise. In addition, as noted above, the calculation of Koyo's imported TRBs parts using our standard methodology would not pose an undue burden. For these reasons we determined that the potential gains in accuracy did outweigh the burden of applying the standard methodology. Therefore, it was not appropriate to apply the methodologies enumerated in the statute to Koyo's imported TRBs parts in this review. Therefore, we requested that Koyo respond to the further-manufacturing section of our questionnaire. (For further explanation of Koyo's further manufacturing, refer to ''Facts Available'' section.) No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value

A. Viability

Based on (1) our comparison of the aggregate quantity of home market and U.S. sales, (2) the absence of any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country does not permit a proper comparison, and (3) the fact that each company's quantity of sales in the home market was greater than five percent of its sales to the U.S. market, we determined that the quantity of the foreign like product, for all respondents except MC, sold in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of subject merchandise to the

United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. 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.

MC is an exporter of TRBs which did not sell TRBs in the exporting country. Rather, MC only sold TRBs in the U.S. market and in three third-country markets: the United Kingdom (UK), Germany, and Canada. In order to determine which third-country market provided the proper basis for comparison, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act, we compared the quantity of MC's sales in the United States to the quantity in the UK and Germany. Absent any information that a particular market situation does not permit a proper comparison, we determined that the aggregate quantity of MC's sales of the foreign like product in the UK and Germany were sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of subject merchandise in the United States because the quantity of MC's sales in the U.K. and Germany was greater than 5 percent of the aggregate quantity of MC's sales of subject merchandise in the United States.

Because both the UK and German markets were viable, we next examined whether the merchandise sold in either one of these two markets, in comparison to the other market, was more similar to the merchandise sold in the United States. Our examination revealed that the identical foreign like products were sold in both markets such that neither market, in comparison to the other, had sales of subject merchandise more similar to the U.S. merchandise. Therefore, we compared the volume of sales of the foreign like product in the UK and German markets and found that the UK market had a greater aggregate volume of sales of the foreign like product. As a result, we based NV on the prices at which the foreign like products were first sold for consumption in the United Kingdom.

B. Arm's-Length Sales

For NTN, Koyo, NSK, and Fuji we have excluded from our analysis those sales made to affiliated customers in the home market which were not at arm's length. *See* Section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act. We determined the arm's-length nature of home market sales to affiliated parties by means of our 99.5 percent arm's-length test in which we calculated, for each model, the percentage difference between the weighted-average prices to the affiliated customer and all unaffiliated customers and then calculated, for each affiliated customer, the overall weighted-average percentage difference in prices for all models purchased by the customer. If the overall weighted-average price ratio for the affiliated customer was equal to or greater than 99.5 percent, we determined that all sales to this affiliated customer were at arm's length. Conversely, if the ratio for a customer was less than 99.5 percent, we determined that all sales to the affiliated customer were not at arm's length because, on average, the affiliated customer paid less than unaffiliated customers for the same merchandise. Therefore, we excluded all sales to the affiliated customer from our analysis. Where we were unable to calculate an affiliated customer ratio because identical merchandise was not sold to both affiliated and unaffiliated customers, we were unable to determine if these sales were at arm's length and, therefore, excluded them from our analysis (*see Stainless Steel Wire Rod from France: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review* (61 FR 8915 (March 6, 1996)).

C. Cost-of-Production Analysis

Because we disregarded sales below the cost of production (COP) in our last completed A–588–054 review for Koyo and NSK, and in our last completed A–588–604 review for NTN, Koyo, and NSK, we have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like 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 (*see Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan,* 62 FR 11840 (March 13, 1997)). Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we initiated a COP investigation of sales by Koyo and NSK in both TRBs cases and for NTN in the A–588–604 case.

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, plus selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A) and the cost of all expenses incidental to placing the foreign like product in condition packed ready for shipment. We relied on the home market sales and COP information provided by Koyo, NTN, and NSK except in those instances where the data was not appropriately quantified or valued (*see* the company-specific COP/CV preliminary results memoranda).

After calculating COP, we tested whether home market sales of TRBs were made at prices below COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities and whether such prices permit the 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 home market sales for a model are at prices less than the COP, we do not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because we determine that the below-cost sales were not made within an extended period of time in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's home market sales of a given model are at prices less than COP, we disregard the below-cost sales because they are 1) 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 the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act.

The results of our cost tests for Koyo, NTN, and NSK indicated that for certain home market models, less than 20 percent of the sales of the model were at prices below COP. We therefore retained all sales of the model in our analysis and used them as the basis for determining NV. Our cost test for these respondents also indicated that, within an extended period of time (one year, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act), for certain home market models more than 20 percent of the home market sales were sold at prices below COP. In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we therefore excluded these below-cost sales from our analysis and used the remaining above-cost sales as the basis for determining NV.

D. Product Comparisons

For all respondents except MC we compared U.S. sales with contemporaneous sales of the foreign like product in the home market. We considered bearings identical on the basis of nomenclature and determined most similar TRBs using our sum-of-the-deviations model-match methodology which compares TRBs according to the following five physical criteria: inside diameter, outside diameter, width, load rating, and Y2 factor. For Koyo, NTN, and NSK we used a 20 percent

difference-in-merchandise (difmer) cost deviation cap as the maximum difference in cost allowable for similar merchandise, which we calculated as the absolute value of the difference between the U.S. and home market variable costs of manufacturing divided by the U.S. total cost of manufacturing. Because Fuji, a reseller, was unable to provide the variable and total costs of manufacturing for the TRBs it purchased from Japanese producers, it instead provided its acquisition cost for each TRB model purchased from Japanese producers. As a result, consistent with our practice in past TRBs reviews for Fuji, we used these acquisition costs as the basis for our 20-percent difmer cap (*see, e.g., Tapered Roller Bearings and Part Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan: Preliminary Results of Administrative Reviews and Termination in Part,* 61 FR 25200 (May 20, 1996)). For MC, we compared U.S. sales with contemporaneous sales of the foreign like product in the UK, a third-country market. Because MC provided us with limited model-match information, we were unable to find matches for a small number of U.S. sales. Therefore, for those sales for which we were unable to find matches due to MC's failure to provide necessary information, we resorted to facts available (refer to the ''Facts Available'' section above).

E. Level of Trade

To the extent practicable, we determine NV for sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales (either EP or CEP). *See* Section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act. When there are no sales at the same level of trade, we compare U.S. sales to home market (or, if appropriate, third-country) sales to a different level of trade. The NV level of trade is that of the starting-price sales in the home market. When NV is based on CV, the level of trade is that of the sales from which we derive SG&A and profit. (*See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et. al.; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 31571 (June 10, 1997*).)

For both EP and CEP, the relevant transaction for the level-of-trade analysis is the sale (or constructed sale) from the exporter to the importer. While the starting price for CEP is that of a subsequent resale to an unaffiliated buyer, the construction of the CEP results in a price that would have been charged if the importer had not been affiliated. We calculate the CEP by removing from the first resale to an independent U.S. customer the expenses under section 772(d) of the Act and the profit associated with these expenses. These expenses represent activities undertaken by the affiliated importer. Because the expenses deducted under section 772(d) of the Act represent selling activities in the United States, the deduction of these expenses normally yields a different level of trade for the CEP than for the later resale (which we use for starting price). Movement charges, duties, and taxes deducted under section 772(c) of the Act do not represent activities of the affiliated importer, and we do not remove them to obtain the CEP level of trade.

To determine whether home market sales are at a different level of trade than U.S. sales, we examine whether the home market sales are at different stages in the marketing process than the U.S. sales. The marketing process in both markets begins with goods being sold by the producer and extends to the sale to the final user, regardless of whether the final user is an individual consumer or an industrial user. The chain of distribution between the producer and the final user may have many or few links, and each respondent's sales occur somewhere along this chain. In the United States the respondents' sales are generally to an importer, whether independent or affiliated. We review and compare the distribution system in the home market and U.S. export markets, including selling functions, class of customer, and the extent and level of selling expenses for each claimed level of trade. Customer categories such as distributor, original equipment manufacturers (OEM) , or wholesaler are commonly used by respondents to describe levels of trade, but, without substantiation, they are insufficient to establish that a claimed level of trade is valid. An analysis of the chain of distribution and of the selling functions substantiates or invalidates the claimed levels of trade. If the claimed levels are different, the selling functions performed in selling to each level should also be different. Conversely, if levels of trade are normally the same, the selling functions performed should also be the same. Different levels of trade necessarily involve differences in selling functions, but differences in selling functions, even substantial ones, are not alone sufficient to establish a difference in the levels of trade. Different levels of trade are characterized by purchasers at different stages in the chain of distribution and sellers performing qualitatively or quantitatively different functions in selling to them. (*See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et. al.; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Administrative Review, 62 FR 31571 (June 10, 1997*).)

When we compare U.S. sales to home market sales at a different level of trade, we make a level of trade adjustment if the difference in levels of trade affects price comparability. We determine any effect on price comparability by examining sales at different levels of trade in a single market, the home market. Any price effect must be manifested in a pattern of consistent price differentials between home market sales used for comparison and sales at the equivalent level of trade of the export transaction. To quantify the price differences, we calculate the difference in the average of the net prices of the same models sold at different levels of trade. We use the average difference in net prices to adjust NV when NV is based on a level of trade different from that of the U.S. sale. If there is a pattern of no price differences, the difference in levels of trade does not affect price and, therefore, no adjustment is necessary.

Section 773 of the Act provides for an adjustment to NV when NV is based on a level of trade different from that of the CEP if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP and if we are unable to determine whether the difference in levels of trade between the CEP and NV affects the comparability of their prices. This later situation can occur when there is no home market level of trade equivalent to the U.S. sales level or where there is an equivalent home market level but the data are insufficient to support a conclusion on price effect. This adjustment, the CEP offset, is identified in section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act and is the lower of the following:

- The indirect selling expenses on the home market sale, or
- The indirect selling expenses deducted from the starting price used to calculate CEP.

The CEP offset is not automatic each time we use CEP. The CEP offset is made only when the level of trade of the home market sale is more advanced than the level of trade of the U.S. (CEP) sale and there is not an appropriate basis for determining whether there is an effect on price comparability.

We determined that for respondents Koyo and NSK, there were two home market levels of trade and one U.S. level of trade (*i.e.*, the CEP level of trade). For Fuji, we determined that one level of trade existed in the home market and three distinct levels of trade existed in

the U.S. market (the CEP level of trade, and two EP levels of trade). Because there was no home market level of trade equivalent to the U.S. level of trade for Fuji, NSK, and Koyo, and because NV for these firms was more remote from the factory than the CEP, we made a CEP offset adjustment to NV.

We determined that for MC, a single level of trade existed in the third-country market, and that a single EP level of trade existed in the U.S. market. Based on our comparison of the U.S. EP level of trade to the third-country level of trade, we have determined that the third-country level of trade was the same as the EP level of trade.

For NTN we found that there were three home market levels of trade and two (EP and CEP) levels of trade in the U.S. Because there were no home market levels of trade equivalent to NTN's CEP level of trade, and because NV for NTN was more remote from the factory than the CEP, we made a CEP offset adjustment to NV. We also determined that NTN's EP level of trade was equivalent to one of its levels of trade in the home market. Because we determined that there was a pattern of consistent price differences, we made a level-of-trade adjustment to NV for NTN. For a company-specific description of our level-of-trade analysis, see the preliminary analysis memoranda to John Kugelman, on file in Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Main Commerce building.

F. Home Market Price

While we disregarded below-cost home market sales for Koyo, NTN, and NSK, these respondents' remaining home market sales were sufficient to serve as the basis for NV.

For all respondents except MC we based home market prices on the packed, ex-factory or delivered prices to affiliated purchasers (where an arm's-length relationship was demonstrated) and unaffiliated purchasers in the home market. For MC, we based NV on the prices at which the foreign like products were first sold for consumption in the United Kingdom, a third-country market. We made adjustments for differences in packing and for movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. In addition, we 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 CFR 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 to NV by deducting home market direct selling expenses and, where applicable, 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. No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we based NV on CV if 1) sale of a U.S. model matched to a home market model for which no sales were above cost, or 2) we were unable to find a contemporaneous home market match for the U.S. sale. We calculated CV based on the cost of materials and fabrication employed in producing the subject merchandise, SG&A, and profit. In accordance with 772(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 CFR 353.56 for COS adjustments 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. We also made adjustments, where applicable, for home market indirect selling expenses to offset commissions in EP and CEP comparisons.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our reviews, we preliminarily determine the following weighted-average dumping margins exist for the period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1996:

Manufacturer / Exporter / Reseller	Margin (percent)
For the A–588–054 Case:	
Koyo Seiko	8.78
Fuji	.34
NSK	1.85
MC International	1.05
For the A–588–604 Case:	
Fuji	(1)
MC International	(1)
Koyo Seiko	23.26
NTN	27.80
NSK	9.70

[1] No shipments or sales subject to this review. These firms have no rate from any prior segment of this proceeding.

Parties to these proceedings may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice and may request a hearing within ten days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in the case briefs and comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. Parties who submit argument in these proceedings are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the argument. The Department will issue final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of our analysis of the issues in any such written comments or at a hearing, within 120 days of issuance of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the U.S. Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We will calculate importer-specific *ad valorem* duty-assessment rates for the 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 NV and U.S. price, by the total U.S. price value of the sales compared and adjusting the result by the average difference between U.S. price and customs value for all merchandise examined during the POR.) While the Department is aware that the entered value of sales during the POR is not necessarily equal to the entered value of entries during the POR, use of entered value of sales as basis of the assessment rate permits the Department

to collect a reasonable approximation of the antidumping duties which would have been determined if the Department had reviewed those sales of merchandise actually entered during the POR. The Department will issue appropriate appraisement instructions directly to the Customs Service upon completion of the review.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results if these administrative reviews for all shipments of TRBs from Japan 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;

(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 these reviews, a prior review, or the LTFV investigations, 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) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these or any previous reviews conducted by the Department, the cash deposit rate for the A–588–054 case will be 18.07 percent, and 36.52 percent for the A–588–604 case *(see Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews; Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof, from Japan and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, From Japan,* 58 FR 51061 (September 30, 1993)).

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility 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 this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: September 2, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 97–23852 Filed 9–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–810]

Certain Welded Stainless Steel Pipe From Korea; Termination of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of termination of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from petitioners, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 9413, March 3, 1997) the notice of initiation of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain welded stainless steel pipe from Korea, for the period December 1, 1995 through November 30, 1996. On May 6, 1997, we received a request for withdrawal of this review from petitioners. Because this request was timely submitted and because no other interested party requested a review, we are terminating this review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 9, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: G. Leon McNeill or Maureen Flannery, AD/CVD Enforcement, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733.

Applicable Regulations: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 353 (April 1, 1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On December 31, 1996, petitioners [1] requested an administrative review pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a) with respect to the following manufacturers/exporters: Hyundai Pipe Co., Ltd.; L.G. Metals; Pusan Steel Pipe Co., Ltd.; Sammi Metal Products Co., Ltd.; and SEAH Steel Corporation. On March 3, 1997, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c), we initiated an administrative review of this order. On May 6, 1997, we received a timely withdrawal of request for review from petitioners.

Pursuant to 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5) of the Department's regulations, the Department may allow a party that requests an administrative review to withdraw such request not later than 90 days after the date of publication of the notice of initiation of the administrative review.

Because petitioners' request for termination was submitted within the 90-day time limit and there were no requests for review from other interested parties, we are terminating this review.

This termination of administrative review and notice are in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a)(5).

Dated: September 3, 1997.

Roland L. MacDonald,

Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 97–23854 Filed 9–8–97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–122–404]

Live Swine From Canada; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on live swine from Canada for the period April 1, 1995 through March 31, 1996. For information on the net subsidy for all producers covered by this order, see the *Preliminary Results of Review* section of this notice. If the final results remain the same as these preliminary results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as detailed in the *Preliminary Results of Review* section of this notice. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. *See Public Comment* section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: September 9, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Gayle Longest or Lorenza Olivas, Office

[1] Avesta Sheffield Inc.; Bristol Metals; Damascus Tube Division, Damascus-Bishop Tube Co.; Trent Tube Division, Crucible Materials Corporation; and United Steelworkers of America (AFL–CIO/CLC).