

sales contemporaneous to the U.S. sales. This was done to account for the relatively long period of time between the date when the MTP is sold and the date when it is completed for shipment.

Preliminary Results of the Review

We preliminarily determine that the following dumping margins exist:

Manufacturer/ exporter	Time period	Margin (per- cent)
Aida Engineering, Ltd	2/1/96-1/31/97	0.00
Hitachi Zosen Corporation ..	2/1/96-1/31/97	0.00

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. 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, not later than 120 days after the date of publication of this notice.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Upon completion of this review, the Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of MTPs from Japan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date, as provided for by section 751(a)(2)(c) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for reviewed companies will be the rate established in the final results of this review; (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; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this

merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be the rate established in the investigation of sales at less than fair value, which is 14.51 percent.

These deposit rates, 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 353.25(b) 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 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: March 2, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,
Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-5864 Filed 3-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-580-807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film From Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Partial Rescission of Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and partial rescission of review.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from one respondent and three U.S. producers, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET film) from the Republic of Korea. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1996 through May 31, 1997. We preliminarily determine that SKC Limited (SKC) sold subject merchandise below normal value (NV) during the period of review. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct

the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the United States Price and NV. STC Corporation (STC) made no sales or shipments during the POR. Accordingly, we are rescinding the review with respect to STC.

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 (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 6, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Heaney or Linda Ludwig, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4475/3833.

APPLICABLE STATUTE: Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations, codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (1997).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published an antidumping duty order on PET film from the Republic of Korea on June 5, 1991 (56 FR 25660). On June 23, 1997, the petitioners, E.I. DuPont Nemours & Co., Inc., Hoescht Celanese Corporation, and ICI Americas, Inc. requested reviews of SKC, and STC. On June 27, 1997, SKC requested an administrative review of its sales. We published a notice of initiation of the review on August 1, 1997 (62 FR 41339).

In its June 27, 1997 request for review, SKC requested revocation pursuant to 19 CFR 353.25(b). We are not considering SKC's request for revocation at this time because SKC has not sold the subject merchandise at not less than fair value for three consecutive years.

In response to our request for information, STC reported that it had no sales or shipments during the period of review. On November 25, 1997, the Department sent a no-shipment inquiry regarding STC to the U.S. Customs Service. Customs did not report any shipments by STC during the POR.

Accordingly, we are rescinding the review with respect to STC.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and for U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage.

The review covers the period June 1, 1996 through May 31, 1997. The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act, as amended.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of PET film in the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared USP to the NV, as described in the "United States Price" and "Normal Value" sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

United States Price (USP)

In calculating USP, the Department treated SKC's sales as export price (EP) sales, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, when the merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation. The Department treated SKC's sales as constructed export price (CEP) sales, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, when the merchandise was sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers after importation.

EP was based on the delivered, or c.i.f. U.S. port, packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for Korean and U.S. brokerage charges, Korean and U.S. inland freight, ocean freight, U.S. duties, and rebates in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. We made an addition

to EP for duty drawback pursuant to section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act.

CEP was based on the delivered, packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for Korean and U.S. brokerage charges, Korean and U.S. inland freight, ocean freight, rebates, U.S. duties and rebates, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. We made an offset to interest expense and adjustments for post-sale cost and quantity adjustments that were not reflected in the gross price. Pursuant to section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we made an addition to CEP for duty drawback. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we made deductions for selling expenses associated with economic activities in the United States, including warranties, credit, bank charges, and indirect selling expenses. Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, the price was further reduced by an amount for profit to arrive at the CEP.

With respect to subject merchandise to which value was added in the United States by SKC prior to sale to unaffiliated customers, we deducted the cost of further manufacturing in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of PET film in the home market (HM) to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, we compared the volume of home market sales of PET film to the volume of PET film sold in the United States, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. SKC's aggregate volume of HM sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its respective aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we have based NV on HM sales.

Based on the fact that the Department had disregarded sales in the fourth administrative review because they were made below the cost of production (COP), the Department initiated a sales-below-cost of production (COP) investigation for SKC in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act. (The fourth administrative review was the most recently completed review at the time that we issued our antidumping questionnaire.)

We performed a model-specific COP test in which we examined whether each HM sale was priced below the merchandise's COP. We calculated the COP of the merchandise using SKC's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market general expenses and

packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. We allocated yield losses equally between A-Grade and B-grade film because these grades have identical production costs. This is consistent with the methodology employed in past reviews of this case. (See e.g., Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, 62 FR 38064, (July 16, 1997).)

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, in determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below COP, we examined whether such sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such sales were made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given model were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because these below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities. We found that, for certain models of PET film, 20 percent or more of the home market sales were sold at below-cost prices. Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because such sales were found to be made (1) in substantial quantities within the POR (i.e., within an extended period of time) and (2) at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act (i.e., the sales were made at prices below the weighted-average per unit COP for the POR). We used the remaining above-cost sales as the basis of determining NV if such sales existed, in accordance with section 773(b)(1).

On January 8, 1998 the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit issued a decision in *Cemex v. United States*, WL 3626 (Fed.Cir). In that case, based on the pre-URAA version of the Act, the Court discussed the appropriateness of using constructed value (CV) as the basis for foreign market value when the Department finds foreign market sales to be outside "the ordinary course of trade." This issue was not raised by any party in this proceeding. 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 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 information provided by SKC in response to our antidumping questionnaire. We have implemented the Court's decision in this case to the extent that the data on the record permitted.

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of the respondent's cost of materials, fabrication, and general expenses. We allocated yield losses equally between A-grade and B-grade film. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by SKC 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 HM selling expenses. Pursuant to section 773(e)(3) of the Act, we included U.S. packing.

In accordance with section 773(a)(6), we adjusted NV, where appropriate, by deducting home market packing expenses and adding U.S. packing expenses. We also adjusted NV for credit expenses. When NV was based upon home market sales, we made an adjustment for inland freight. For SKC's local export sales, we also made an addition to home market price for duty drawback. For comparisons to EP, we made an addition to NV for U.S. warranty and credit expenses as circumstance-of-sale adjustments pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C) of the Act.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade ("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 CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP, the US LOT is also the level of the starting price sale, which is usually from the exporter to the 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 the unaffiliated customer. If the comparison market sales are 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 a LOT adjustment under section 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 differences 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 *e.g.*, *Certain Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).)

In implementing these principles in this review, we asked SKC to identify the specific differences and similarities in selling functions and/or support services between all phases of marketing in the home market and the United States. SKC identified two channels of distribution in the home market: (1) wholesalers/distributors and (2) end-users. For both channels, SKC performs similar selling functions such as market research and after-sales warranty services. Because channels of distribution do not qualify as separate levels of trade when the selling functions performed for each customer class are sufficiently similar, we determined that there exists one level of trade for SKC's home market sales.

For the U.S. market, SKC reported two LOTs: (1) EP sales made directly to its U.S. customers, and (2) CEP sales made through Sunkyong America Ltd., SKC's wholly owned U.S. subsidiary (CEP

sales). The Department examined the selling functions performed by SKC for both EP and CEP sales. These selling functions included customer sales contacts (i.e., visiting current or potential customers receiving orders, promotion of new products, collection of unpaid invoices), technical services, inventory maintenance, and or business system development. We found that SKC provided a greater degree of these services on EP sales than it did on CEP sales, and that the selling functions were sufficiently different to warrant two separate LOTs in the United States.

When we compared EP sales to home market sales, we determined that both sales were made at the same LOT. For both EP and home market transactions, SKC sold directly to the customer, and provided similar levels of customer sales contacts, technical services, inventory maintenance and business system development. For CEP sales, SKC performed fewer customer sales contacts, technical services, inventory maintenance, and computer legal, audit and business system development. In addition, the differences in selling functions performed for home market and CEP transactions indicates that home market sales involved a more advanced stage of distribution than CEP sales.

Because we compared these CEP sales to HM sales at a different level of trade, we examined whether a level-of-trade adjustment may be appropriate. In this case SKC sold at one level of trade in the home market; therefore, there is no basis upon which SKC has demonstrated a pattern of consistent price differences between levels of trade. Further, we do not have the information which would allow us to examine pricing patterns of SKC's sales of other similar products, and there are no other respondent's or other record evidence on which such an analysis could be based.

Because the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for making a level-of-trade adjustment but the level of trade in Korea for SKC is at a more advanced stage than the level of trade of the CEP sales, a CEP offset is appropriate in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act, as claimed by SKC. We based the CEP offset amount on the amount of home market indirect selling expenses, and limited the deduction for HM indirect selling expenses to the amount of indirect selling expenses deducted from CEP in accordance with section 772(d)(1)(D) of the Act. We applied the CEP offset to NV, whether based on home market prices or CV.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that a margin of 6.83 percent exists for SKC for the period June 1, 1996 through May 31, 1997. Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days of publication of this notice and 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 working day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing, within 120 days after the date of publication of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We have calculated importer-specific ad valorem duty assessment rates based on the total amount of dumping margins calculated for the examined sales during the POR to the total customs of the sales used to calculate these duties. These rates will be assessed uniformly on all entries made during the POR. (This is equivalent to dividing the total amount of antidumping duties, which are calculated by taking the difference between statutory NV and statutory EP or CEP, by the total statutory EP or CEP of the sales compared, and adjusting the average differences between EP or CEP and the entered value for all merchandise entered during the POR.) The Department will issue appraisal instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of PET film from the Republic of Korea 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 rate for reviewed firms will be the rate established in the final results of administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by

manufacturers or exporters not covered in these reviews but covered in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in these reviews, or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the final results of these reviews, or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 21.5%, the "all others" rate established in the LTFV investigation.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26(b) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during these review periods. 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)).

Dated: March 2, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98-5866 Filed 3-5-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-485-602]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished or Unfinished, From Romania; Preliminary Results of Antidumping 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 the petitioner, The Timken Company ("Timken"), and the respondent, Tehnoimportexport, S.A. ("TIE"), the Department of Commerce ("the Department") is conducting an administrative review of the

antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished or unfinished ("TRBs"), from Romania. The review covers shipments of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period June 1, 1996, through May 31, 1997.

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 6, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carrie Blozy or Rick Johnson, Office of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0374 or (202) 482-0165.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act), are to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to 19 CFR Part 353, as they existed on April 1, 1996.

Background

On June 19, 1987, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (52 FR 23320) the antidumping duty order on TRBs from Romania. On June 11, 1997, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 31786, 31787) a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review of this antidumping duty order. On June 30, 1997, the Department received requests from the petitioner and the respondent to conduct an administrative review of TIE. On August 1, 1997, in accordance with 19 CFR 353.22(c), we published the notice of initiation of this antidumping administrative review in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 41340).

Scope of This Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of TRBs from Romania. These products include flange, take-up cartridge, and hanger units incorporating tapered roller bearings, and tapered roller housings (except pillow blocks) incorporating tapered rollers, with or without spindles, whether or not for automotive use. This merchandise is currently classifiable