Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist for the period June 1, 1996, through May 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/exporter	Margin (percent)
Wafangdian	0.00
Luoyang	1.82
CMC	0.02
Xiangfan	14.93
Zhejiang	2.27
Wanxiang	0.00
Liaoning	0.68
Premier	3.99
Chin Jun	0.21
ZX (the new shipper)	0.00
PRC Rate	29.40

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice. Interested parties may also request a hearing within thirty days of publication. If requested, a hearing will be held 37 days after publication. Interested parties may submit case briefs within thirty days of publication. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than five days after the case briefs. The Department will issue a notice of the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such briefs, within 120 days from the publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. With respect to EP sales for these preliminary results, we divided the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between NV and EP) for each importer/customer by the total number of units sold to that importer/customer. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative and new shipper review, we will direct Customs to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of that importer's/customer's entries under the order during the review period. Although this will result in assessing different percentage margins for individual entries, the total antidumping duties collected for each importer/customer under the order for the review period will be almost exactly equal to the total dumping margins.

For CEP sales, we divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for each importer/customer. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will direct Customs to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered Customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's/customer's entries during the review period. 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 the 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 review those sales of merchandise actually entered during the POR.

The following cash deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) for the PRC companies named above the cash deposit rates will be the rates for these firms established in the final results of this review, except that for exporters with de minimis rates, i.e., less than 0.50 percent, no deposit will be required; (2) for all remaining PRC exporters, all of which were found not to be entitled to separate rates, the cash deposit will be 29.40 percent; and (3) for non-PRC exporters Premier and Chin Jun the cash deposit rates will be the rates established in the final results of this review; (4) for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC, other than Premier and Chin Jun, the cash deposit rate will be the rate applicable to the PRC supplier of that exporter. These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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 thisrequirement 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 in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 771(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 30, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–18301 Filed 7–9–98; 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 and Recission in Part.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from respondents, 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 one reseller/exporter of subject merchandise to the United States during the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997. The review of the A–588–604 order covers two manufacturers/exporters and one reseller/exporter, and the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997.

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 (USP) and the normal value. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties which 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: July 10, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Charles Ranado or Stephanie Arthur,

AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–3518 or, 482–6312, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

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 351 (62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997)).

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 2, 1997, the Department published the notice of ''Opportunity to Request Administrative Review'' for both TRBs cases covering the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997 (62 FR 51628).

In accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), on October 28, 1997, NTN Corporation (NTN) requested that we conduct a review of its sales in the A–588–604 case. In addition, on October 31, 1997, Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd. (Koyo) requested that we conduct a review of its sales in the A–588–054 case, and Fuji Heavy Industries, Ltd. (Fuji) and NSK Ltd. (NSK) requested that we conduct a review of their sales in both the A–588–054 and A–588–604 TRB cases. On November 15, 1997, we published in the **Federal Register** a notice of initiation of these antidumping duty administrative reviews covering the period October 1, 1996 through September 30, 1997 (62 FR 58513).

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, 1996 through September 30, 1997. The review of the A–588–054 finding covers TRB sales by two manufacturers/exporters (Koyo and NSK) and one reseller/exporter (Fuji). The review of the A–588–604 order covers TRB sales by two manufacturers/exporters (NTN and NSK) and one reseller/exporter (Fuji). As explained in the ''Recission in Part'' section of this notice, we are terminating our reviews in both the A–588–054 and A–588–604 cases for two of the four firms.

Recission in Part

In accordance with section 351.213(d)(1) of the Department's regulations, on January 9, 1998, NSK withdrew its request for review in both the A–588–054 and A–588–604 cases. In addition, on January 23, 1998, Fuji withdrew its request for review in both the A–588–054 and A–588–604 cases. Because we received timely requests for the withdrawal of review from both NSK and Fuji, and because no other party to the proceedings requested a review for NSK and Fuji in either the A–588–054 or A–588–604 cases, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(1), we are rescinding both the A–588–054 and A–588–604 reviews for NSK and Fuji.

Use of Facts Available

We preliminary determine, in accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, that the use of facts available is appropriate in one type of situation. We used partial facts available in instances where we were unable to use some portion of a response in calculating the dumping margin. For partial facts available, we extrapolated information from the company's response and used that information in our calculations. Koyo's response indicates that for certain sales to original equipment manufacturers (OEM sales) there were no pre-sale freight expenses. However, from the information reported, we were unable to identify those OEM sales for which Koyo incurred no pre-sale freight expenses; therefore, we have applied non-adverse facts available and recalculated the expense adjustment. For further information, please see the preliminary analysis memorandum on file for Koyo.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

Because all of Koyo's sales and certain of 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) as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, for all of Koyo's sales and certain of NTN's sales. 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) of the Act: 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 advertising expenses, and indirect technical services 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.

NTN 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 cash deposits (*i.e.*, the cost of having money unavailable for a period of time). However, we have changed our practice of accepting such an adjustment. See *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et. al.; Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review,* 63 FR 33347 (June 18, 1998).

Because certain of NTN's sales of subject merchandise were made to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States prior to importation into the United States and the CEP 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 applicable. 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 on the Department in 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 the methods described in 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) of the Act in lieu of the standard methodology. *See 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,* 62 FR 47452 at 47455 (September 9, 1997).

NTN imported subject merchandise (TRBs parts) which was further processed in the United States. NTN 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. Based on information provided by NTN, 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 the value added was likely to exceed substantially the value of the imported TRB parts.

We then examined whether it would be appropriate to use sales of non-further-manufactured merchandise as a basis for comparison, as stated under paragraphs 772(e)(1) and (2) of the Act. 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. In NTN's case, any potential gains in accuracy gained 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 TRB parts. Furthermore, other sales are in sufficient quantity for the purpose of determining dumping margins for NTN's imported TRBs which were further manufactured in the United States prior to resale. Therefore, we have used the weighted-average dumping margins we calculated on NTN's sales of non-further-manufactured TRBs.

No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value

A. Viability

Based on 1) 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 and 2) the absence of any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country does not permit a proper comparison, we determined that the quantity of the foreign like product for all respondents 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.

B. Arm's-Length Sales

For NTN and Koyo 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 to 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, and 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, we excluded them from our analysis (*see, e.g., Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rod from France: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 61 FR 8915 (March 6, 1996); *Certain Stainless Steel Wire Rods from France: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 63 FR 30185 (June 3, 1998)).

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 in our last completed A–588–604 review for NTN, we have reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of NV in these reviews 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,* 63 FR 2558 (January 15, 1998)). Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we initiated a COP investigation of sales by Koyo in the A–588–054 case and 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 and NTN except in those instances where the data were not appropriately quantified or valued (*see* the company-specific COP/CV preliminary results memoranda, on file in Import Administration's Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the main Commerce building).

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 permitted 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 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 1) they are 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, they 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 and NTN 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 (normally 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 and were not sold at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. 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

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. 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.

E. Level of Trade (LOT)

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same LOT as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting-price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on constructed value (CV), that of the sales from which we derive selling, SG&A expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting-price sale, which is usually from exporter to importer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP, we examine stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and unaffiliated customer. If the comparison-market sales are at at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison-market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make an LOT adjustment under 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the difference in the levels between NV and CEP affects price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(a)(7)(B) of the act (the CEP offset provision). See *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less than Fair Value; Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa,* 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

We determined that for Koyo there were two home market LOTs and one U.S. LOT (*i.e.*, the CEP LOT). Because there was no home market LOT equivalent to the U.S. LOT, and because NV for Koyo was more remote from the factory than the CEP, we made a CEP offset adjustment to NV.

For NTN we found that there were three home market LOTs and two (EP and CEP) LOTs in the United States. Because there were no home market LOTs equivalent to NTN's CEP LOT, 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 LOT was equivalent to one of its LOTs in the

home market. Because we determined that there was a pattern of consistent price differences, we made a LOT adjustment to NV for NTN when we compared sales at different LOTs. For a company-specific description of our LOT analysis, see the preliminary analysis memoranda.

F. Home Market Price

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. 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 351.410. 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. 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.

On January 8, 1998, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (the Court) issued a decision in *Cemex* v. *United States*, 133 F.3d 897 (Fed. Cir. 1998). In that case, based on the pre-URAA version of the Act, the Court discussed the appropriateness of using CV as the basis for foreign market value when the Department finds home market sales to be outside the ordinary course of trade. This issue was not raised by any party in these 1996–97 reviews. However, the URAA amended the definition of sales outside the ''ordinary course of trade'' to include sales below cost. See section 771(15) of the Act. Consequently, the Department has reconsidered its practice in accordance with this court decision and has determined that it would be inappropriate to resort directly to CV, in lieu of foreign market sales, as the basis for NV if the Department finds foreign market sales of merchandise identical or most similar to that sold in the United States to be outside the ordinary course of trade. Instead, the Department will use sales of similar merchandise, if such sales exist. The Department will use CV as the basis for NV only when there are no above-cost sales that are otherwise suitable for comparison. Therefore, in this proceeding, when making comparisons in accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products sold in the home market as described in the Scope of the Investigation section of this notice, above, that were in the ordinary course of trade for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market made in the ordinary course of trade to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to sales of the most similar foreign like product made in the ordinary course of trade, based on the characteristics listed in Sections B and C to our antidumping questionnaire. We have implemented the Court's decision in this case, to the extent that the data on the record permitted. *See, e.g., Brass Sheet and Strip from Canada: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Notice of Intent Not to Revoke Order in Part,* 63 FR 33037, 33038 (June 17, 1998).

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 LOT, using the selling expenses and profit determined for each LOT in the comparison market. Where appropriate, we made adjustments to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 for COS adjustments and LOT 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, 1996 through September 30, 1997:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Margin (percent)
For the A–588–054 Case:	
Koyo Seiko	7.62
For the A–588–604 Case:	
NTN	18.83

Parties to these proceedings may request disclosure within five days of the date of publication of this notice and may request a hearing within thirty days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 37 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 35 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. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we will calculate importer-specific *ad valorem* 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. 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 of 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 less-than-fair-value 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 Final 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 64720 (December 9, 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.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.213.

Dated: July 2, 1998.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–18309 Filed 7–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Montana State University-Bozeman; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 98–010. Applicant: Montana State University-Bozeman, Bozeman, MT 59717. Instrument: Optical Helium Cryostat. Manufacturer: Institute of Physics, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, C.I.S. Intended Use: See notice at 63 FR 12451, March 13, 1998.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) Rapid cool-down (30–60 min.), (2) minimal initial vacuum (10^{-3} Torr), (3) portable operation and (4) low evaporation (2–3 liters per cooling cycle). The National Institute of Standards and Technology advised June 25, 1998 that (1) These capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purpose and (2) it knows of no domestic instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument for the applicant's intended use.

We know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 98–18306 Filed 7–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Stanford University; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Docket Number: 97–095R. Applicant: Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA 94304. Instrument: Ultrasound Bone Densitometer. Manufacturer: McCue Plc, United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 62 FR 65679, December 15, 1997.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument, for such purposes as it is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides: (1) Reduced transducer size (½ inch) appropriate for use with children's feet, (2) external calipers for precise placement of the transducers and (3) available normative standards from studies indicating a precision of 3–5% for repeated measurements. These capabilities are pertinent to the applicant's intended purposes and we know of no other instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instrument which is being manufactured in the United States.

Frank W. Creel,

Director, Statutory Import Programs Staff.

[FR Doc. 98–18305 Filed 7–9–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

University of Texas at Austin, et al.; Notice of Consolidated Decision on Applications for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instruments

This is a decision consolidated pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Comments: None received. Decision: Approved. No instrument of equivalent scientific value to the foreign instruments described below, for such purposes as each is intended to be used, is being manufactured in the United States.

Docket Number: 97–086R. Applicant: University of Texas at Austin, 78712. Instrument: 3–D Motion Analysis System, Model Vicon 140. Manufacturer: Oxford Metrics, Ltd., United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 62 FR 53594, October 15, 1997. Reasons: The foreign instrument provides precise time-matched data collection for analog samples and video motion data by using a single clock and phase-locking analog signals with the motion data. Advice received from: National Institutes of Health, June 8, 1998.

Docket Number: 98–016. Applicant: University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706–1490. Instrument: High Speed Length Controller, Model 308B. Manufacturer: Crystallox, Ltd., United Kingdom. Intended Use: See notice at 63 FR 15831, April 1, 1998. Reasons: The foreign instrument