

relate solely to the internal personnel and organizational issues of the BBG or the International Broadcasting Bureau. (5 U.S.C. 552b.(c)(2) and (6))

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Persons interested in obtaining more information should contact either Brenda Hardnett or Carol Booker at (202) 401-3736.

Dated: February 4, 2003.

Carol Booker,

Legal Counsel.

[FR Doc. 03-3183 Filed 2-5-03; 11:49 am]

BILLING CODE 8230-01-M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-427-801, A-428-801, [A-475-801, A-559-801]

Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, and Singapore: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Rescission of Administrative Reviews, and Notice of Intent To Revoke Order In Part

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

ACTION: Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Rescission of Administrative Reviews, and Notice of Intent to Revoke Order in Part.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from interested parties, the Department of Commerce is conducting administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, and Singapore. The merchandise covered by these orders are ball bearings and parts thereof. The reviews cover nine manufacturers/exporters. The period of review is May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value by various companies subject to these reviews. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative reviews, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 7, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please contact the appropriate case analysts for the various respondent firms, as listed below, at Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

France

Mino Hatten (SNR Roulements), Dunyako Ahmadu (SKF), Mark Ross, or Richard Rimlinger.

Germany

Dunyako Ahmadu (FAG), Sochieta Moth (SKF), Catherine Cartos (Paul Mueller), Jeffrey Frank (Torrington), Mark Ross, or Richard Rimlinger.

Italy

Fred Aziz (FAG), Janis Kalnins (SKF), Mark Ross, or Richard Rimlinger.

Singapore

Yang Jin Chun (NMB/Pelmec) or Richard Rimlinger.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 15, 1989, the Department published in the *Federal Register* the antidumping duty orders on ball bearings and parts thereof (BBs) from France (54 FR 20902), Germany (54 FR 20900), Italy (54 FR 20903), and Singapore (54 FR 20907). On June 25, 2002, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), we published a notice of initiation of administrative reviews of these orders (67 FR 42753).

On October 23, 2002, the Department rescinded the following administrative reviews: INA-Schaeffler KG (INA) and Sachs Handel GmbH and ZF Sachs (collectively Sachs) with respect to ball bearings from Germany; SKF France S.A. with respect to spherical plain bearings from France; Barden Corporation (U.K.) Ltd., with respect to ball bearings from the United Kingdom. See *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al: Partial and Full Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 67 FR 65089 (Oct. 23, 2002).

Subsequent to the publication of our rescission notice, we received withdrawals of the requests we had received for reviews of Ringball Corporation (France, Germany, and Italy) with respect to BBs. Because there were no other requests for review of the above-named firm and no other interested party objected, we are rescinding the reviews with respect to this company in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d).

Scope of Reviews

The products covered by these reviews are ball bearings and parts thereof (BBs). These products include all AFBs that employ balls as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classified under the following categories: antifriction balls, ball bearings with integral shafts, ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted ball bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following *Harmonized Tariff Schedules* (HTSUS) subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.10.10, 8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.05, 8482.99.2580, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.6595, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.50.8040, 8483.50.90, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.60.80, 8708.70.6060, 8708.70.8050, 8708.93.30, 8708.93.5000, 8708.93.6000, 8708.93.75, 8708.99.06, 8708.99.31, 8708.99.4960, 8708.99.50, 8708.99.5800, 8708.99.8080, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, and 8803.90.90.

The size or precision grade of a bearing does not influence whether the bearing is covered by the order. For a listing of scope determinations which pertain to the orders, see the Scope Determinations Memorandum (Scope Memorandum) from the Antifriction Bearings Team to Laurie Parkhill, dated April 1, 2002, and hereby adopted by this notice. The Scope Memorandum is on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU), Main Commerce Building, Room B-099, in the General Issues record (A-100-001) for the 01/02 reviews.

Although the HTSUS item numbers above are provided for convenience and customs purposes, written descriptions of the scope of these proceedings remain dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by certain respondents using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturers' facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and the selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public versions of the verification reports, which are on file in the CRU, Room B-099. We will also be verifying certain companies (SKF France, SKF Germany, and SNR) shortly after

publication of these preliminary results of reviews.

Use of Facts Available

In accordance with section 776(a) of the Act, we preliminarily determine that the use of facts available as the basis for the weighted-average dumping margin is appropriate for Torrington Nadellager. The firm did not respond to our antidumping questionnaire and, consequently, we find that it has not provided "information that has been requested by the administering authority" under section 776(a)(1) of the Act.

In accordance with section 776(b) of the Act, we are making an adverse inference in our application of the facts available. This is appropriate because Torrington Nadellager has not acted to the best of its ability in providing us with relevant information which is under its control. As adverse facts available for this firm, we have applied the highest rate we have calculated for any company under review in any segment of the relevant proceedings on BBs from Germany. We have selected this rate because it is sufficiently high as to reasonably assure that Torrington Nadellager does not obtain a more favorable result by failing to cooperate. Specifically, this rate is 70.41 percent.

Section 776(c) of the Act provides that the Department shall, to the extent practicable, corroborate secondary information used for facts available by reviewing independent sources reasonably at its disposal. Information from a prior segment of the proceeding or from another company in the same proceeding constitutes secondary information. The Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, H.R. Doc. 103-316, at 870 (1994) (SAA), provides that the word "corroborate" means that the Department will satisfy itself that the secondary information to be used has probative value. As explained in *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 Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews*, 61 FR 57391, 57392 (Nov. 6, 1996) (*Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan*), in order to corroborate secondary information, the Department will examine, to the extent practicable, the reliability and relevance of the information used. However, unlike other types of information, such as input costs or selling expenses, there

are no independent sources for calculated dumping margins. The only source for margins is administrative determinations. Thus, with respect to an administrative review, if the Department chooses as facts available a calculated dumping margin from a prior segment of the proceeding, it is not necessary to question the reliability of the margin for that time period.

With respect to the relevance aspect of corroboration, however, the Department will consider information reasonably at its disposal as to whether there are circumstances that would render a margin not relevant. Where circumstances indicate that the selected margin is not appropriate as adverse facts available, the Department will disregard the margin and determine an appropriate margin. See *Fresh Cut Flowers from Mexico; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 61 FR 6812 (Feb. 22, 1996), where the Department disregarded the highest dumping margin as best information available because the margin was based on another company's uncharacteristic business expense resulting in an unusually high margin. Further, in accordance with *F.LII De Cecco Di Filippo Fara S. Martino S.p.A. v. United States*, 216 F.3d 1027 (Fed. Cir. June 16, 2000), we also examine whether information on the record would support the selected rates as reasonable facts available.

We find that the 70.41 percent rate which we are using for these preliminary results does have probative value. We compared the selected margins to margins calculated on individual sales of the merchandise in question made by German companies covered by the instant review. We found a substantial number of sales, made in the ordinary course of trade and in commercial quantities, with dumping margins near or exceeding the rate under consideration. The details of this analysis are contained in the analysis memorandum for Torrington Nadellager dated January 31, 2003. This evidence supports an inference that the selected rate reflects the actual dumping margin for the firm in question.

Furthermore, there is no information on the record that demonstrates that the rate we have selected is an inappropriate total adverse facts-available rate for the company in question. On the contrary, our existing record supports the use of this rate as the best indication of the export price and dumping margin for this firm as explained in our January 31, 2003, memorandum. Therefore, we consider the selected rate to have probative value with respect to the firm in question in

this review and to reflect the appropriate adverse inference.

Intent to Revoke

On May 31, 2002, Paul Mueller requested the revocation of the order covering BBs from Germany as it pertains to its sales of these bearings.

Under section 751 of the Act, the Department "may revoke, in whole or in part" an antidumping duty order upon completion of a review. Although Congress has not specified the procedures that the Department must follow in revoking an order, the Department has developed a procedure for revocation that is set forth under 19 CFR 351.222. Under subsection 351.222(b), the Department may revoke an antidumping duty order in part if it concludes that: (i) An exporter or producer has sold the merchandise at not less than normal value for a period of at least three consecutive years; (ii) the exporter or producer has agreed in writing to its immediate reinstatement in the order if the Secretary concludes that the exporter or producer, subsequent to the revocation, sold the subject merchandise at less than normal value; and (iii) the continued application of the antidumping duty order is no longer necessary to offset dumping. Subsection 351.222(b)(3) states that, in the case of an exporter that is not the producer of subject merchandise, the Department normally will revoke an order in part under subsection 351.222(b)(2) only with respect to subject merchandise produced or supplied by those companies that supplied the exporter during the time period that formed the basis for revocation.

A request for revocation of an order in part must address three elements. The company requesting the revocation must do so in writing and submit the following statements with the request: (1) The company's certification that it sold the subject merchandise at not less than normal value during the current review period and that, in the future, it will not sell at less than normal value; (2) the company's certification that, during each of the consecutive years forming the basis of the request, it sold the subject merchandise to the United States in commercial quantities; (3) the agreement to reinstatement in the order if the Department concludes that the company, subsequent to revocation, has sold the subject merchandise at less than normal value. See 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1).

We preliminarily determine that the request from Paul Mueller meets all of the criteria under 19 CFR 351.222(e)(1). With regard to the criteria of subsection

351.222(b)(2), our preliminary margin calculations show that this firm sold BBs at not less than normal value during the current review period. See dumping margins below. In addition, it sold BBs at not less than normal value in the two previous administrative reviews in which it was involved. See *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part*, 65 FR 49219 (Aug. 11, 2000), covering the period May 1, 1998, through April 30, 1999, and *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part*, 67 FR 55780 (Aug. 30, 2002), covering the period May 1, 2000, through April 30, 2001. Based on our examination of the sales data submitted by Paul Mueller, we preliminarily determine that Paul Mueller sold the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in each of the consecutive years cited by Paul Mueller to support its request for revocation, including the intervening unreviewed years. See preliminary results calculation memorandum for Paul Mueller, dated January 31, 2003, which is in the Department's CRU, Room B-099. Thus, we preliminarily find that Paul Mueller had zero or *de minimis* dumping margins for its last three administrative reviews and sold in commercial quantities in all years, including the unreviewed intervening years. Also, we preliminarily determine that application of the antidumping order to Paul Mueller is no longer warranted for the following reasons: (1) the company had zero or *de minimis* margins for a period of at least three consecutive years; (2) the company has agreed to immediate reinstatement of the order if the Department finds that it has resumed making sales at less than fair value; and (3) the continued application of the order is not otherwise necessary to offset dumping.

Therefore, we preliminarily determine that Paul Mueller qualifies for revocation of the order on BBs pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2) and that the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Paul Mueller should be revoked.

If these preliminary findings are affirmed in our final results, we will revoke this order in part for Paul Mueller and, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(f)(3), we will terminate the suspension of liquidation for any of the merchandise in question that is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after May 1, 2002,

and will instruct Customs to refund any cash deposits for such entries.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used export price or constructed export price (CEP) as defined in sections 772(a) and (b) of the Act, as appropriate. Due to the extremely large volume of transactions that occurred during the period of review and the resulting administrative burden involved in calculating individual margins for all of these transactions, we sampled CEP sales in accordance with section 777A of the Act. When a firm made more than 10,000 CEP sales transactions to the United States of merchandise subject to a particular order, we reviewed CEP sales that occurred during sample weeks. We selected one week from each two-month period in the review period, for a total of six weeks, and analyzed each transaction made in those six weeks. The sample weeks are as follows: May 27 June 2, 2001; August 19 25, 2001; September 16 22, 2001; December 2 8, 2001; February 17 23, 2002; and March 24 30, 2002. We reviewed all export-price sales transactions made during the period of review.

We calculated export price and CEP based on the packed F.O.B., C.I.F., or delivered price to unaffiliated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. We made deductions, as appropriate, for discounts and rebates. We also made deductions for any movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act and the SAA at 823-824, we calculated the CEP by deducting selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, which includes commissions, direct selling expenses, indirect selling expenses, and U.S. repacking expenses. When appropriate, in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act, we also deducted the cost of any further manufacture or assembly, except where we applied the special rule provided in section 772(e) of the Act. See below. Finally, we made an adjustment for profit allocated to these expenses in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

With respect to subject merchandise to which value was added in the United States prior to sale to unaffiliated U.S. customers, e.g., parts of bearings that were imported by U.S. affiliates of foreign exporters and then further processed into other products which were then sold to unaffiliated parties, we determined that the special rule for merchandise with value added after

importation under section 772(e) of the Act applied to all firms that added value in the United States.

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

To determine whether the value added is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise, we estimated the value added based on the difference between the averages of the prices charged to the first unaffiliated purchaser for the merchandise as sold in the United States and the averages of the prices paid for the subject merchandise by the affiliated purchaser. Based on this analysis, we determined that the estimated value added in the United States by all firms accounted for at least 65 percent of the price charged to the first unaffiliated customer for the merchandise as sold in the United States. See 19 CFR 351.402(c) for an explanation of our practice on this issue. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that for all firms the value added is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise. Also, for those companies, we determine that there was a sufficient quantity of sales remaining to provide a reasonable basis for comparison and that the use of these sales is appropriate. See analysis memoranda for SKF France, SKF Germany, SKF Italy, FAG Germany, Paul Mueller, and NMB/Pelmec dated January 31, 2003. Accordingly, for purposes of determining dumping margins for the sales subject to the special rule, we have used the weighted-average dumping margins calculated on sales of identical or other subject merchandise sold to unaffiliated persons. No other adjustments to export price or CEP were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home-market and U.S. sales and absent any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country did not permit a

proper comparison, we determined that the quantity of foreign like product sold by all respondents in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. Each company's quantity of sales in its home market was greater than five percent of its sales to the U.S. market. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based normal value on the prices at which the foreign like products were first sold for consumption in the exporting country.

Due to the extremely large number of transactions that occurred during the period of review and the resulting administrative burden involved in examining all of these transactions, we sampled sales to calculate normal value in accordance with section 777A of the Act. When a firm had more than 10,000 home-market sales transactions on a country-specific basis, we used sales in sample months that corresponded to the sample weeks that we selected for U.S. CEP sales, sales in the month prior to the period of review, and sales in the month following the period of review. The sample months were April, May, August, September, and December of 2001, and February, March, and June of 2002.

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

Because we disregarded below-cost sales in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act in the last completed review with respect to ball bearings sold by SNR, SKF France, SKF Italy, Paul Mueller, and SKF Germany (see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al: Final Results of Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part*, 65 FR 49219, 49221 (Aug. 11, 2000), or *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al: Final Results of Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part*, 67 FR 55780, 55781 (Aug. 30, 2002)), we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of normal value in these reviews may have been made at prices below the cost of production (COP) as provided by section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we conducted COP investigations of sales by these firms in the home market.

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, the selling, general and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and all costs and expenses incidental to packing the merchandise. In our COP analysis, we used the home-market sales and COP information provided by each respondent in its questionnaire responses.

After calculating the COP, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we tested whether home-market sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below the 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, when less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because the below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time. When 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the period of review were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because they were made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time pursuant to sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act and because, based on comparisons of prices to weighted-average COPs for the period of review, we determined that these sales were at prices which would not permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Based on this test, we disregarded below-cost sales with respect to all of the above-mentioned companies.

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

Home-market prices were based on the packed, ex-factory, or delivered prices to affiliated or unaffiliated purchasers. When applicable, we made

adjustments for differences in packing and for movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. We also made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and for differences in circumstances of sale in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. For comparisons to export price, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from and adding U.S. direct selling expenses to normal value. For comparisons to CEP, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from normal value. We also made adjustments, when applicable, for home-market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in export-price and CEP calculations.

With respect to adjustments for differences in payment terms and for inventory credit expenses, Paul Mueller claimed that it did not have any short-term borrowings in the United States upon which to base a short-term borrowing rate and used a prime lending rate. The record indicates, however, that a wholly owned subsidiary of Paul Mueller did have a short-term borrowing rate in the United States and we used this rate to calculate credit for all U.S. sales made by Paul Mueller. See analysis memorandum for Paul Mueller dated January 31, 2003.

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

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we used constructed value as the basis for normal value when there were no usable sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market. We calculated constructed value in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials and fabrication, SG&A expenses, and profit in the calculation of constructed value. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by each respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the home market.

When appropriate, we made adjustments to constructed value in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 for circumstances-of-sale differences and level-of-trade differences. For comparisons to export price, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from and adding U.S. direct selling expenses to normal value. For comparisons to CEP, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from normal value. We also made adjustments, when applicable, for home-market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in export-price and CEP comparisons.

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

We found that NMB/Pelmec reported a small number of U.S. models for which it did not report CV data. We will obtain additional information to allow us to consider these transactions for our final results of administrative review. See analysis memorandum for NMB/Pelmec dated January 31, 2003.

Level of Trade

To the extent practicable, we determined normal value for sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales (either export price or CEP). When there were no sales at the same level of trade, we compared U.S. sales to home-market sales at a different level of trade. The normal-value level of trade is that of the starting-price sales in the home market. When normal value is based on

constructed value, the level of trade is that of the sales from which we derived SG&A and profit.

To determine whether home-market sales are at a different level of trade than U.S. sales, we examined 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 were at a different level of trade from that of a U.S. sale and the difference affected price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which normal value is based and comparison-market sales at the level of trade of the export transaction, we made a level-of-trade adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. See, e.g., *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731 (Nov. 19, 1997).

For a company-specific description of our level-of-trade analysis for these preliminary results, see Memorandum to Laurie Parkhill from Antifriction Bearings Team Regarding Level of Trade, dated January 31, 2003, on file in the CRU, Room B-099.

Preliminary Results of Reviews

As a result of our reviews, we preliminarily determine the following percentage weighted-average dumping margins on BBs for the period May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002:

FRANCE

Company	Margin
SNR Roulements	3.49
SKF	5.68

GERMANY

Company	Margin
FAG	1.44
Torrington	70.41
Paul Mueller	0.19
SKF	3.20

ITALY

Company	Margin
FAG	2.86
SKF	5.10

SINGAPORE

Company	Margin
NMB/Pelmec	1.62

Comments

Any interested party may request a hearing within 21 days of the date of publication of this notice. A general-issues hearing, if requested, and any hearings regarding issues related solely to specific countries, if requested, will be held at the main Commerce Department building at a time and location to be determined.

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

Case	Briefs Due	Rebuttals Due
General Issues	March 17, 2003	March 24, 2003
France	March 18, 2003	March 25, 2003
Germany	March 19, 2003	March 26, 2003
Italy	March 20, 2003	March 27, 2003
Singapore	March 21, 2003	March 28, 2003

The Department will publish the final results of these administrative reviews, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs. The Department will issue final results of these reviews within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess,

antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated, whenever possible, an exporter/importer (or customer)-specific assessment rate or value for subject merchandise.

Export-Price Sales

With respect to export-price sales, for these preliminary results we divided the

total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between normal value and export price) for each exporter's importer/customer by the total number of units the exporter sold to that importer/customer. We will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of that importer's/customer's entries under the relevant order during the review period.

Constructed Export Price Sales

For CEP sales (sampled and non-sampled), we divided the total dumping margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for each importer. We will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's entries under the relevant order during the review period. See 19 CFR 351.212(a).

Cash-Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash-deposit rate for each respondent (*i.e.*, each exporter and/or manufacturer included in these reviews), we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that company's sales of merchandise during the review period. In order to derive a single weighted-average margin for each respondent, we weight-averaged the export-price and CEP deposit rates (using the export price and CEP, respectively, as the weighting factors). To accomplish this when we sampled CEP sales, we first calculated the total dumping margins for all CEP sales during the review period by multiplying the sample CEP margins by the ratio of total days in the review period to days in the sample weeks. We then calculated a total net value for all CEP sales during the review period by multiplying the sample CEP total net value by the same ratio. Finally, we divided the combined total dumping margins for both export-price and CEP sales by the combined total value for both export-price and CEP sales to obtain the deposit rate.

Entries of parts incorporated into finished bearings before sales to an unaffiliated customer in the United States will receive the respondent's deposit rate applicable to the order.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative reviews for all shipments of AFBs entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash-deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates established in the final results of 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 this review, a prior review, or the 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) the cash-deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be the "All Others" rate for the relevant order made effective by the final results of review published on July 26, 1993. See *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation in Part of an Antidumping Duty Order*, 58 FR 39729 (Jul. 26, 1993). For BBs from Italy, see *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews, and Revocation in Part of Antidumping Duty Orders*, 61 FR 66472 (Dec. 17, 1996). These rates are the "All Others" rates from the relevant less-than-fair-value investigations.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative reviews.

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f) 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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing these determinations in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: January 31, 2003.

Bernard T. Carreau,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03-3090 Filed 2-6-03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-S

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-549-807]

Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From Thailand: Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On August 7, 2002, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of administrative review of the antidumping duty (AD) order on carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Thailand. This review covers one foreign producer/exporter, Thai Benkan Company, Ltd. (TBC). The period of review (POR) is July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001. Based on our analysis of the comments received, we have made changes in the margin calculations. Therefore, the final results differ from the preliminary results. The final weighted-average dumping margin for the reviewed firm is listed below in the section entitled "*Final Results of the Review.*"

EFFECTIVE DATE: February 7, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Zev Primor or Tom Futtner, Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Office 4, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4114 or 482-3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 7, 2002, the Department published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the AD order on carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Thailand. See *Certain Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings from Thailand: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 67 FR 51178 (August 7, 2002) (*Preliminary Results*). The POR is July 1, 2000, through June 30, 2001; the is TBC. We conducted verification of the information submitted on the record by TBC and issued our verification report on December 9, 2002. We invited parties to comment on our preliminary results of review. On December 20, 2002, we received TBC's case brief. On January 3, 2003, we received rebuttal comments from Tube Forgings of America, Inc., one of the original petitioners in the less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation. No interested party requested a public hearing in this proceeding.

The Department has conducted this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).