

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Ausimont will be 6.64 percent; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original less than fair value 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 be 46.46 percent for the reasons explained in *Granular Polytetrafluoroethylene Resin From Italy; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 60 FR 53735 (October 17, 1994).

These deposit requirements shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final 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 notice also serves as a reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APOs) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d)(1). Timely written notification of the return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: May 9, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-12512 Filed 5-17-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-570-815]

Sulfanilic Acid From the People's Republic of China; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by a U.S. importer of the subject merchandise to the United States and by petitioner, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC). The review covers ten manufacturers/exporters of subject merchandise to the United States and the period August 1, 1993 through July 31, 1994. The review indicates the existence of dumping margins during the period of review.

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

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karin Price or Maureen Flannery, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 19, 1992, the Department published in the Federal Register (57 FR 37524) the antidumping duty order on sulfanilic acid from the PRC. On August 3, 1994, the Department published in the Federal Register (59 FR 39544) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this antidumping duty order. On August 30, 1994, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a) (1994), a U.S. importer of sulfanilic acid from the PRC, PHT International, Inc. (PHT), requested that we conduct an administrative review of four exporters, China National Chemical Construction Company (CNCCC), Hainan Garden Trading Company

(Hainan Garden), Yude Chemical Industry Company (Yude), and Zhenxing Chemical Industry Company (Zhenxing). On August 31, 1994, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(a), petitioner, R-M Industries, Inc., requested that we conduct an administrative review of Baoding No. 3 Chemical Factory (Baoding), China National Chemical Construction Corporation, Qingdao Branch (CNCCC Qingdao), CNCCC, Jinxing Chemical Factory (Jinxing), Sinochem Hebei Import & Export Corporation (Sinochem Hebei), Sinochem Qingdao, Sinochem Shandong, Yude, and Zhenxing. We published the notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on September 16, 1994 (59 FR 47609). The notice of initiation was amended on April 14, 1995 (60 FR 19017). The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise stated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by this review are all grades of sulfanilic acid, which include technical (or crude) sulfanilic acid, refined (or purified) sulfanilic acid and sodium salt of sulfanilic acid.

Sulfanilic acid is a synthetic organic chemical produced from the direct sulfonation of aniline with sulfuric acid. Sulfanilic acid is used as a raw material in the production of optical brighteners, food colors, specialty dyes, and concrete additives. The principal differences between the grades are the undesirable quantities of residual aniline and alkali insoluble materials present in the sulfanilic acid. All grades are available as dry, free flowing powders.

Technical sulfanilic acid, classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.24 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS), contains 96 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 1.0 percent maximum aniline, and 1.0 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials. Refined sulfanilic acid, also classifiable under the subheading 2921.42.24 of the HTS, contains 98 percent minimum sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent maximum aniline and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials.

Sodium salt, classifiable under the HTS subheading 2921.42.79, is a powder, granular or crystalline material which contains 75 percent minimum equivalent sulfanilic acid, 0.5 percent

maximum aniline based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content, and 0.25 percent maximum alkali insoluble materials based on the equivalent sulfanilic acid content.

Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, our written description of the scope of this proceeding is dispositive.

This review covers 10 manufacturers/exporters of sulfanilic acid from the PRC, Baoding, CNCCC, CNCCC Qingdao, Jinxing, Hainan Garden, Sinochem Hebei, Sinochem Shandong, Sinochem Qingdao, Yude, and Zhenxing. The review period is August 1, 1993 through July 31, 1994.

Verification

As provided by section 776(b) of the Act, we conducted verifications of the information provided by CNCCC, Hainan Garden, Sinochem Hebei, Yude, and Zhenxing. We also conducted verifications of two related importers of the subject merchandise, Alchemy International and PHT, at their facilities in the United States. We conducted the verifications using standard verification procedures, including onsite inspection of the manufacturers' 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.

Separate Rates

To establish whether a company is sufficiently independent to be entitled to a separate rate, the Department analyzes each exporting entity under the test established in the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sparklers from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 20588, May 6, 1991) (*Sparklers*), as amplified in the *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Silicon Carbide from the People's Republic of China* (59 FR 22585, May 2, 1994) (*Silicon Carbide*). Under this policy, exporters in non-market-economy (NME) countries are entitled to separate, company-specific margins when they can demonstrate an absence of government control, both in law (*de jure*) and in fact (*de facto*), with respect to exports. Evidence supporting, though not requiring, a finding of *de jure* absence of government control over export activities includes: (1) An absence of restrictive stipulations associated with an individual exporter's business and export licenses; (2) any legislative enactments decentralizing control of companies; and (3) any other formal measures by the government

decentralizing control of companies. *De facto* absence of government control with respect to exports is based on four criteria: (1) Whether the export prices are set by or subject to the approval of a government authority; (2) whether each exporter retains the proceeds from its sales and makes independent decisions regarding the disposition of profits and financing of losses; (3) whether each exporter has autonomy in making decisions regarding the selection of management; and (4) whether each exporter has the authority to negotiate and sign contracts and other agreements.

Baoding submitted its response to the Department's request for information regarding separate rates in Chinese, but did not respond to our request that the response be translated into English or to further requests for information. Jinxing, CNCCC Qingdao, and Sinochem Qingdao did not respond to our requests for information. Sinochem Shandong submitted a response indicating that it had no exports of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review; however, it did not submit a response to the Department's questionnaire regarding separate rates. Therefore, we have not given Baoding, Jinxing, CNCCC Qingdao, Sinochem Qingdao, or Sinochem Shandong a separate rate.

CNCCC, Hainan Garden, Sinochem Hebei, Yude, and Zhenxing have responded to the Department's request for information regarding separate rates. We have found that the evidence on the record demonstrates an absence of government control, both in law and in fact, with respect to their exports according to the criteria identified in *Sparklers* and *Silicon Carbide* for this period of review, and have assigned to each of these companies a separate rate. For further discussion of the Department's preliminary determination that each of these companies is entitled to a separate rate, see *Decision Memorandum to Holly A. Kuga, Director, Office of Antidumping Compliance*, dated August 24, 1995, "Separate rates in the 1993/1994 administrative review of sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China," which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Collapsing

The Department "collapses" related firms (*i.e.*, treats them as a single entity for review purposes and assigns them a single dumping margin) where the type and degree of relationship is so significant that we find that there is a strong possibility of price manipulation

(*Nihon Cement Co., Ltd. v. United States*, 17 CIT 400 (1993) (*Nihon*)). Because Yude and Zhenxing each formed joint ventures with PHT during the period of review, we have considered whether Yude and Zhenxing should be collapsed for purposes of this administrative review as a result of their relationships with PHT.

In determining whether to collapse related parties, the Department considers the following criteria:

- Whether the companies have interlocking boards of directors;
- Whether the companies have similar production processes, facilities, or equipment so as to facilitate shifting of production between the facilities;
- Whether the companies operate as separate and distinct entities;
- Whether the companies share marketing and sales information or offices; and
- Whether the companies are involved in the pricing or production decisions of the other entity.

See *Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Canada* (58 FR 37099, July 9, 1993) and *Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products, and Certain Corrosion-Resistant Carbon Steel Flat Products from Japan* (58 FR 37154, July 9, 1993).

The use of these factors was upheld by the Court of International Trade (CIT) in *Nihon*. In *Nihon*, the CIT held that, although each of these criteria does not have to be met in order for the Department to collapse related parties, the Department must consider them all.

Based on our analysis of these criteria, we have determined that there is a strong possibility of price manipulation between Yude and Zhenxing, and that Yude and Zhenxing should be collapsed as a result of their relationships with PHT. We have found that some of the same people sit on Yude's and Zhenxing's boards of directors, that Yude and Zhenxing have similar production processes, and that PHT makes sales decisions for each of the joint ventures. For a further discussion of this issue, see *Memorandum from Case Analyst to the File*, dated February 20, 1996, "Analysis for the preliminary results of the 1993/1994 administrative review of sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China—Yude Chemical Industry Company and

Zhenxing Chemical Industry Company," which is on file in the Central Records Unit (room B-099 of the Main Commerce Building).

We are collapsing Yude and Zhenxing for the purposes of calculating margins, and we are collapsing their factor data for use in calculating FMV. We have calculated one FMV for Yude and Zhenxing by weight averaging Yude's and Zhenxing's factors based on the quantities of sulfanilic acid each produced during the period of review.

United States Price

The Department used purchase price and exporter's sales price (ESP), in accordance with sections 772 (b) and (c) of the Act, in calculating U.S. price. We made deductions from purchase price and ESP sales, where appropriate, for foreign inland freight, ocean freight, and marine insurance, in accordance with section 772(d)(2)(A). We used surrogate data from India to value foreign inland freight, marine insurance, and ocean freight, in accordance with section 773(c). We selected India as the surrogate country for reasons explained in the "Foreign Market Value" section of this notice. We made additional deductions from ESP sales, where appropriate, for U.S. duties, U.S. brokerage and handling, U.S. inland freight, containerization expenses, and repacking in the United States, in accordance with section 772(d)(2)(A).

Foreign Market Value

For companies located in NME countries, section 773(c)(1) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine FMV using a factors of production methodology if (1) the merchandise is exported from a NME country, and (2) the information does not permit the calculation of FMV using home market prices, third country prices, or constructed value under section 773(a) of the Act.

In every case conducted by the Department involving the PRC, the PRC has been treated as an NME country. None of the parties to this proceeding has contested such treatment in this review. Accordingly, we calculated FMV in accordance with section 773(c) of the Act and section 353.52 of the Department's regulations. Pursuant to section 773(c)(4), we determined that India is comparable to the PRC in terms of per capita gross national product (GNP), the growth rate in per capita GNP, and the national distribution of labor, and that India is a significant producer of comparable merchandise. For further discussion of the Department's selection of India as the primary surrogate country, see

Memorandum from Director, Office of Policy, to Acting Division Director, Office of Antidumping Compliance, dated April 13, 1995, "Sulfanilic Acid from the People's Republic of China (PRC): Nonmarket Economy Status and Surrogate Country Selection," and *File Memorandum*, dated August 8, 1995, "India as a significant producer of comparable merchandise in the 1993/1994 administrative review of sulfanilic acid from the People's Republic of China," which are on file in the Central Records Unit (room B099 of the Main Commerce Building).

For purposes of calculating FMV, we valued PRC factors of production as follows, in accordance with section 773(c)(1) of the Act:

- To value aniline used in the production of sulfanilic acid, we used the rupee per kilogram value of imports into India during April 1993-March 1994, obtained from the March 1994 *Monthly Statistics of the Foreign Trade of India, Volume II—Imports (Indian Import Statistics)*. Using wholesale price indices (WPI) obtained from the *International Financial Statistics*, published by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), we adjusted this value to reflect inflation through the period of review. We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

- To value sulfuric acid used in the production of sulfanilic acid, we used the rupee per kilogram value reported in *Chemical Weekly*. We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

- To value activated carbon used in the production of sulfanilic acid, we used the rupee per kilogram value reported in *Chemical Business*. We made adjustments to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

- For direct labor, we used the labor rates reported in the Business International Corporation reports *IL&T India*, released November 1993. This source breaks out labor rates between skilled and unskilled labor for 1993 and provides information on the number of labor hours worked per week. Using WPI obtained from the *International Financial Statistics*, we adjusted the labor rates to reflect inflation through the period of review.

- For factory overhead, we used information reported in the September 1994 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. From this information, we were able to determine factory overhead as a percentage of total cost of manufacture.

- For selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, we used information obtained from the September 1994 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. We calculated an SG&A rate by dividing SG&A expenses by the cost of manufacture.

- To calculate a profit rate, we used information obtained from the September 1994 *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*. We calculated a profit rate by dividing the before-tax profit by the sum of those components pertaining to the cost of manufacturing plus SG&A.

- To value the inner and outer bags used as packing materials, we used import statistics for India obtained from the *Indian Import Statistics*. Using WPI obtained from the *International Financial Statistics*, we adjusted these values to reflect inflation through the period of review. We adjusted these values to include freight costs incurred between the suppliers and the sulfanilic acid factories.

- To value coal, we used the price of steam coal reported in *The Gazette of India*, June 16, 1994.

- To value electricity, we used the price of electricity reported in the *Electric Utilities Data Book for the Asian and Pacific Region*, January 1993, for the period April 1993 through March 1994. We adjusted the value of electricity to reflect inflation through the period of review using WPI published by the IMF.

- To value truck freight, we used the rate reported in a June 1992 cable from the U.S. Embassy in India submitted for the *Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Sulfanilic Acid from the People's Republic of China* (57 FR 29705, July 6, 1992). We adjusted the truck freight rates to reflect inflation through the period of review using WPI published by the IMF.

- To value rail freight, we used the price reported in a December 1989 cable from the U.S. Embassy in India submitted for the *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Shop Towels of Cotton from the People's Republic of China* (56 FR 4040, February 1, 1991). We adjusted the rail freight rates to reflect inflation through the period of review using WPI published by the IMF.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions in accordance with 19 CFR 353.60(a). Currency conversions were made at the rates certified by the Federal Reserve Bank.

Best Information Available

We preliminarily determine, in accordance with section 776(c) of the

Act, that the use of best information available (BIA) is appropriate for Baoding, CNCCC Qingdao, Jinxing, and Sinochem Qingdao because these companies did not respond to our requests for information. Section 776(c) of the Act states that the Department shall use BIA whenever a company refuses or is unable to produce information in a timely manner and in the form required, or significantly impedes an investigation.

In deciding what to use as BIA, section 353.37(b) of the Department's regulations provide that the Department may take into account whether a party refuses to provide requested information or impedes a proceeding. Thus, the Department determines on a case-by-case basis what is BIA. The Department uses a two-tiered approach in its choice of BIA. When a company refuses to provide the information requested in the form required or otherwise significantly impedes the Department's review (first tier), the Department will normally assign to that company the higher of (1) the highest rate found for any firm in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a prior administrative review; or (2) the highest rate found in the current review for any firm. When

a company has cooperated with the Department's request for information but fails to provide information requested in a timely manner or in the form required such that margins for certain sales cannot be calculated (second tier), the Department will normally assign to those sales the higher of (1) the highest margin calculated for that company in any previous review or the original investigation for the same class or kind of merchandise; or (2) the highest calculated margin for any respondent in the current review. See *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation in Part of An Antidumping Duty Order (Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand and the United Kingdom)* (58 FR 39729, July 26, 1993). This practice has been upheld in *Allied-Signal Aerospace Co. v. United States*, 996 F.2d 1185 (Fed. Cir. 1993), and *Krupp Stahl AG et al. v. United States*, 822 F. Supp. 789 (CIT 1993).

We have applied BIA to sales made by Baoding, CNCCC Qingdao, Jinxing, and Sinochem Qingdao. Because these firms did not respond to our questionnaires,

as BIA we have applied the highest margin ever in the LTFV investigation, prior administrative reviews, or in this review, which is 85.20 percent. Because these firms have not been found eligible for a separate rate, they form the basis of the PRC country-wide rate, which is therefore also based on non-cooperative BIA.

Non Shipper

Sinochem Shandong submitted a response to the Department's questionnaire stating that it did not ship sulfanilic acid to the United States during the period of review. There is no evidence on the record to demonstrate that Sinochem Shandong shipped subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review. Since we have no information to determine whether Sinochem Shandong merits a separate rate for this review, as discussed in the separate rates section above, Sinochem Shandong falls within the PRC country-wide rate.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine that the following margins exist:

Manufacturer/Exporter	Time period	Margin (percent)
China National Chemical Construction Corporation	8/1/93-7/31/94	47.51
Hainan Garden Trading Company	8/1/93-7/31/94	53.36
Sinochem Hebei Import & Export Corporation	8/1/93-7/31/94	2.01
Yude Chemical Industry Company ¹	8/1/93-7/31/94	0.00
Zhenxing Chemical Industry Company ¹	8/1/93-7/31/94	0.00
PRC Rate	8/1/93-7/31/94	85.20

¹ Yude and Zhenxing have been collapsed for the purposes of this administrative review. However, we have listed them separately on this chart for Customs purposes.

Parties to the proceeding may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice. Any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the publication of this notice, or the first workday thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication. See section 353.38(d) of the Department's regulations. The Department will publish a notice of final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such comments.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate

entries. Individual differences between U.S. price and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisalment instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of sulfanilic acid from the PRC 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) the cash deposit rates for the reviewed companies named above which have separate rates will be the rates for those firms established in the final results of this administrative review; (2) for the companies named above which were not found to have separate rates, Baoding, CNCCC Qingdao, Jinxing, Sinochem Qingdao,

and Sinochem Shandong, as well as for all other PRC exporters, the cash deposit rate will be the highest margin ever in the LTFV investigation or in this or prior administrative reviews, the PRC rate; and (3) the cash deposit rate for non-PRC exporters of subject merchandise from the PRC 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.

Notification of Interested Parties

This notice serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under section 353.26 of the Department's regulations 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 in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and section 353.22 of the Department's regulations.

Date: May 9, 1996.

Paul L. Joffe,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 96-12517 Filed 5-17-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-588-604; A-588-054]

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 and Termination in Part

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

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

SUMMARY: In response to requests by the petitioner and two respondents, the Department of Commerce (the Department) has conducted administrative reviews of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from Japan (A-588-604), and of the finding on tapered roller bearings, four inches or less in outside diameter, and components thereof, from Japan (A-588-054). The review of the A-588-054 finding covers four manufacturers/exporters and ten resellers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994, and one manufacturer/exporter for the period October 1, 1992, through September 30, 1993. The review of the A-588-604 order covers five manufacturers/exporters, ten resellers/exporters, and seventeen firms identified by the petitioner in this case as forging producers, and the period October 1, 1993, through September 30, 1994. The A-588-604 review also covers one manufacturer/exporter for the period October 1, 1992, through September 30, 1993.

We have preliminarily determined that sales of tapered roller bearings (TRBs) have been made below the foreign market value (FMV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the FMV.

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 20, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Valerie Turoscy or Robert James, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482-5253.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

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 7, 1994 (59 FR 51166), the Department published the notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" for both TRB cases. The petitioner, the Timken Co., and two respondents requested administrative reviews. We initiated the A-588-054 and A-588-604 administrative reviews for the period October 1993 through September 1994 on November 14, 1994 (59 FR 56459).

The Department has now conducted these reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act). However, we have not conducted a review of Honda Motor Co., Ltd. (Honda) for either the A-588-054 or the A-588-604 case. In our preliminary results notice for the 1992-93 administrative reviews, we published our intent to revoke the A-588-054 finding as to Honda and explained that our final determination concerning Honda's revocation would be published in our final results notice

for the 1992-93 administrative reviews (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, Termination in Part, and Intent to Revoke in Part*, 60 FR 22349 (May 5, 1995)). We have not yet completed those final results and our final determination concerning Honda's revocation has not yet been made. Upon our determination concerning Honda's revocation and the publication of our final results of review for the 1992-93 administrative review period, we will proceed accordingly for Honda in both the A-588-054 and A-588-604 cases.

This notice also includes, along with our 1993-94 preliminary results of review for Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd. (Koyo), our 1992-93 preliminary results of review for Koyo for both the A-588-054 finding and the A-588-604 order. Because our scope proceeding regarding Koyo's rough forgings was concurrent with our 1992-93 preliminary results analysis, we determined that, rather than delay our 1992-93 preliminary results of review for all other reviewed firms, we would conduct Koyo's 1992-93 reviews in both cases after making our final scope determination concerning Koyo's rough forgings. On February 2, 1995, we published in the Federal Register our final scope decision concerning Koyo's rough forgings (60 FR 6519), in which we determined that Koyo's rough forgings are within the scope of the A-588-604 order. We provided Koyo additional time to submit its sales and cost information concerning its rough forgings for both the 1992-93 and 1993-94 administrative reviews and have now conducted our review of Koyo for both these periods in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act.

Scope of the Review

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 the 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 tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for