

and during operations. What other establishment operations might benefit from similar regulatory approaches?

- Is it necessary or desirable to employ the same inspection methodology in all similar establishments?
- What roles should Federal, State, and local governments play in verifying the safe transportation and storage of potentially hazardous foods?
- How we can best coordinate with State and local authorities to minimize restaurant and institutional outbreaks linked to meat and poultry products?
- How can FSIS verify allied industry management of food safety risks as meat and poultry products move from the establishment to consumers?
- What systems do establishments have in place for ensuring in-distribution protection of meat and poultry products? How does industry measure the performance of these systems?
- What in-plant inspection objectives can be supplemented or replaced with in-distribution inspection models?
- What additional suggestions are there for data collection efforts to be carried out in distribution channels?
- Are the in-distribution alternatives identified in the ANPR of November 22, 1996 (61 FR 59372), useful? In what ways?

Done at Washington, DC on: June 4, 1997.

Thomas J. Billy,
Administrator.

[FR Doc. 97-15115 Filed 6-5-97; 3:26 pm]

BILLING CODE 3410-DM-P

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Food Safety and Inspection Service

[Docket No. 97-037N]

Interstate Distribution of State-Inspected Meat and Poultry Products

AGENCY: Food Safety and Inspection Service, USDA.

ACTION: Notice of public meetings; request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) is soliciting comments on ways it can improve Federal and State cooperation in the implementation of the Federal meat and poultry inspection laws, and on whether, and if so how, those laws should be amended to permit meat and poultry products inspected by State inspection programs to be distributed in interstate commerce. State inspection programs are authorized under the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA) and

the Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA) to inspect meat and poultry establishments that prepare products intended for use as human food solely for distribution within the State under requirements "at least equal to" those imposed under Federal inspection.

DATES: The meetings will be held on June 16 and 17, 1997, in Sioux Falls, SD, and on July 22, 1997, in Washington, DC. Written information and comments will be accepted and made a part of the record of these proceedings through August 22, 1997.

ADDRESSES: The first meeting will be held from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. on June 16 and from 9:00 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. on June 17, 1997, at the Radisson Encore Inn, 4300 Empire Place, Sioux Falls, SD 57106-6525; telephone (605) 361-6684. The second meeting will be held from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on July 22, 1997, in the Ticonderoga Room of the Hyatt Regency Washington on Capitol Hill, 400 New Jersey Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20001. Persons sending written comments should send an original and two copies to the FSIS Docket Clerk, Docket No. 97-037N, Room 102 Annex Building, 300 12th Street, SW, Food Safety and Inspection Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC 20250-3700.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Persons wishing to participate in either of the two meetings are requested to register by contacting Ms. Traci Phebus by telephone at (202) 501-7138, by FAX at (202) 501-7642, or by E-mail at HACCP.Confer@USDA.GOV. Participants may reserve a 5-minute comment period when they register. More time may be available, depending on the number of people wishing to make a presentation and the time needed for questions, following the presentations. Reservations will be confirmed on a first-come, first-served basis. Written comments may also be submitted for the record at the meetings. For questions about the meetings contact Mr. Ralph Stafko at (202) 720-7774, or FAX at (202) 720-2345.

Participants who require a sign language interpreter or other special accommodations should contact Ms. Jennifer Callahan at (202) 501-7138.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: A number of State Departments of Agriculture operating their own meat and poultry inspection programs have expressed various concerns about the relationship between the State programs and the Federal meat and poultry inspection program, and, in addition, have advocated amendments in Federal laws to permit State-inspected meat and poultry products to be distributed in

interstate commerce. FSIS will conduct public hearings to explore these concerns and any recommended alternative policies and procedures, including proposals to amend Federal laws to improve the cooperative relationship between Federal and State meat and poultry inspection programs. The following information is provided in order to encourage the discussion of these issues and the submission of relevant information and comment.

Background

FSIS must provide Federal inspection at any meat and poultry establishment that produces meat and poultry products for interstate or foreign commerce, or that produces such products for intrastate commerce if the State in which it is located does not operate its own program. Those approximately 6,500 establishments, encompassing very large to very small establishments, produce the vast majority of the nation's inspected meat and poultry products slaughtered and processed in the United States.

Twenty-six states operate their own inspection programs, which collectively inspect approximately 2,800 mostly small and mid-size meat and poultry plants (Table 1). Estimates of the proportion of the nation's meat and poultry products that are State-inspected have ranged as high as 7 percent. FSIS data, limited to slaughter operations and not accounting for processed products, show that State-inspected establishments slaughter commercially a little more than 1 percent of the nation's livestock and a small fraction of 1 percent of the nation's poultry by weight.

To ensure that States are enforcing requirements "at least equal to" the Federal requirements, FSIS inspection program personnel work directly with State inspection officials providing advice and guidance on Federal inspection requirements on a continuing basis and also conduct periodic reviews of the State inspection programs. FSIS reviews each State program's State Performance Plan (SPP) annually. The SPP is a compilation of applicable State laws and regulations, program resources, and current operations and enforcement activities (FSIS Directive 5720.2, Cooperative Inspection Programs). In addition, teams of FSIS experts periodically conduct comprehensive on-site reviews, including random sampling of records and inspection of conditions in State-inspected plants. State programs are rated as: 1, Acceptable; 2, Acceptable with Minor Variations; 3, Acceptable with Significant Variations; and 4,

Unacceptable. A "1" is reviewed at least every 5 years; a "2" at least every 4 years; a "3" at least every 3 years; and a "4" as frequently as necessary, depending on the nature of the findings. Presently, 6 States are rated "1", 14 States are rated "2", and 6 States are rated "3".

If a State does not have an "at least equal to" State inspection program, the State is designated by FSIS as one in which Federal inspection must be provided for all meat and poultry establishments requiring inspection under Federal law, regardless of whether the establishments' products are distributed solely within the State. Currently, 24 States have no meat and poultry inspection programs. (Table 2).

In addition to the State administered meat and poultry inspection programs, State agencies also enforce adulteration and mislabeling requirements of State and local laws governing meat and poultry products in commercial channels outside inspected establishments. Although the products are concurrently subject to FMIA and PPIA adulteration and mislabeling provisions, FSIS relies heavily on State and local agencies to ensure inspected products are kept safe, wholesome, and properly labeled as they are handled during distribution, and prepared and held for sale to consumers at retail stores and restaurants.

Federal Support of State and Local Programs

State meat and poultry inspection programs are an integral part of the Federal regulatory system for ensuring the safety of the nation's meat and poultry products. Accordingly, the FMIA and PPIA provide for FSIS cooperation with State agencies in carrying out the provisions of the Federal inspection laws and specify that FSIS may furnish State agencies advisory assistance, technical and laboratory assistance and training, and financial and other aid for administration of the State programs—up to 50 percent of the cost of any State's program. Currently, FSIS provides about \$40.5 million to 26 States for administering the State inspection programs. In addition, FSIS allocates funds specifically for training assistance to State programs.

Some States have found that despite Federal support, they cannot maintain a State inspection program, and have deferred to FSIS to conduct all meat and poultry inspection within their States. Even in States maintaining inspection programs, State legislatures sometimes appropriate less than 50 percent of the (USDA) estimated cost, thereby

reducing proportionately the amount of Federal money contributed to the State program. In those cases, non-monetary Federal assistance in areas such as training is especially important to the State programs.

In addition to 50 percent Federal funding of, and non-monetary assistance to, State inspection programs, FSIS from time to time enters into cooperative agreements with State agencies and provides funding for those agencies to conduct Federal inspection, or other enforcement activities under FMIA and PPIA within those States. This authority is provided under the Talmadge-Aiken Act, which gives the Secretary authority to enter into such agreements "[i]n order to avoid duplication of functions, facilities and personnel, and to attain closer coordination and greater effectiveness and economy in administration of Federal and State laws * * * within his area of responsibility * * *" (7 U.S.C. 450). Currently, FSIS has agreements under its Federal-State Cooperative Inspection Program with 9 States, under which employees of State inspection agencies carry out Federal inspection in 255 establishments under USDA supervision (Table 3). FSIS provides 50 percent funding for that work.

The President's Food Safety Initiative directs USDA and other Federal food safety and public health agencies to improve coordination and cooperation among themselves and with State and local governments on food safety matters. The Initiative recognizes the importance of State and local food safety agencies and provides for additional Federal support of those State and local activities. For example, the Initiative would improve training of State inspectors in Federal food safety standards and provide to States equipment and technology for rapid sharing of inspection results to develop a national database for monitoring all food inspections.

FSIS is working closely with FDA, State and local governments, and organizations representing industry, consumers, and public health professionals to promote more effective food safety programs. FSIS also is developing, in cooperation with the Association of Food and Drug Officials, training and training materials on potentially high-risk meat and poultry processing activities for State and local food inspection agencies that oversee meat and poultry processing at retail and food service operations. Although retail and food service facilities generally are exempt from federally mandated inspection, they are engaged in processing activities similar to those

in inspected establishments. In recognition of the need for more Federal support for State agencies primarily responsible for regulating retail and food service establishments, the Administration's 1998 FSIS budget requests \$565,000 for training State and local food inspectors on meat and poultry processing and related food safety matters. In addition, FSIS participates in the Partnership for Food Safety Education, a broad alliance of industry, government, and other organizations, which is developing a comprehensive plan for food safety education of consumers and others who handle food.

FSIS believes it is essential to maintain and strengthen the State administered meat and poultry inspection programs. FSIS officials understand the concern of State officials of inspection programs that the statutory requirement that State-inspected plants have Federal inspection in order to ship interstate can result in a decrease in the number of State-inspected plants and potentially threaten the viability of the affected State program. Accordingly, FSIS solicits the views and specific recommendations of all interested parties regarding how the Agency can enhance its support of, and assist in improving, State inspection programs under its current authorities.

Amending FMIA and PPIA

FSIS also is seeking comment on whether, and if so how, the FMIA and PPIA should be amended to permit distribution of State-inspected meat and poultry products in interstate commerce.

Some State Departments of Agriculture, mostly through the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA), contend that because a State inspection program must be "at least equal to" Federal inspection, sales of State-inspected meat and poultry products should not be limited to commercial distribution only in that State, thereby denying State-inspected establishments access to markets that could help them survive and prosper in an increasingly competitive marketplace. Proponents of this view often cite the case where a State-inspected plant located right next to the State line is cut off from what would otherwise be a natural market because it is restricted to intrastate sales. Many State program officials also point out that while State-inspected products are restricted to intrastate sale, imported products can be sold freely in any State.

Efforts to obtain statutory amendments that would permit

interstate distribution of State-inspected products led to a 1996 request for USDA to report to Congress on the issue. The Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996, also known as the 1996 Farm Bill, directed the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to Congress a report concerning steps necessary to achieve interstate shipment of products inspected under State programs that are "at least equal to" the Federal inspection program.

The Department submitted this report to Congress in July, 1996. The report recommended that before State-inspected establishments are authorized to ship products in interstate commerce, certain conditions should be met: These conditions are: (1) States should implement FSIS's Pathogen Reduction/Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point systems; (2) FSIS resources would need to be adequate to accommodate any additional oversight required to substantiate "at least equal to" status; (3) such legislation should clarify that the Secretary retains ultimate authority over products prepared for interstate commerce; and (4) additional issues, mostly dealing with potential conflicts between Federal and State laws, would have to be resolved.

Recently, two bills (H.R. 801 and H.R. 1137) have been introduced in Congress to amend the FMIA and PPIA to permit

the interstate distribution of State-inspected meat and poultry. The Department has determined that the changes proposed by these bills raise a number of important food safety issues that require plenary discussion and careful consideration. Some of the issues that need to be considered are as follows:

- Whether legislative changes to the FMIA and PPIA to provide for interstate distribution of State-inspected products should be enacted or made effective prior to implementation of HACCP?

- Whether and, if so how, Federal oversight of State programs should be strengthened in the event State-inspected products are authorized to be shipped interstate?

- Whether allowing the interstate distribution of State-inspected products would lead to "competing" inspector programs among the States and between the States and the Federal program, and also to "forum shopping?"

- Whether and how other pending or proposed regulatory actions should be taken into account before any of the proposed legislative changes are made effective? Further, there are a number of jurisdictional issues central to the discussion:

- Whether there would be concurrent State and Federal jurisdiction regarding the denial/withdrawal/withholding of grants of inspection?

- Who would have jurisdiction over misbranding/adulteration violations?

- Whether States will have separate authority to detain/seize/condemn/recall products in commercial channels outside plants?

The foregoing list of issues is not intended to be exhaustive. FSIS welcomes discussion and comments on all issues related to the interstate shipment of meat and poultry from State-inspected establishments.

Done in Washington, DC, on: June 4, 1997.

Thomas J. Billy,
Administrator.

Table 1 summarizes the number of States at the end of fiscal year 1996 with intrastate inspection programs for meat (26) and poultry (24); the number of State full-time equivalent staff years during fiscal year 1996; and Federal funding assistance expended by States during fiscal year 1996. "M" after the name of the State indicates that the State conducted a meat inspection program; "M&P" indicates that the State conducted meat and poultry inspection programs. In order to continue operating intrastate inspection programs and to continue receiving Federal funding assistance, States must maintain inspection requirements at least equal to those of the Federal program.

TABLE 1.—STATE INSPECTION PROGRAMS

	Regular plants			Total	Custom exempt plants				Full time equivalent staff years	FY 1996 federal assistance
	Meat	Poultry	Meat and poultry		Meat	Poultry	Meat and Poultry	Total		
ALABAMA M&P	70	5	3	78	20	0	0	20	15.5	1,274,376
ALASKA M&P	7	0	8	15	1	0	0	1	5.0	341,155
ARIZONA M&P	63	2	0	65	27	0	0	27	24.8	584,388
DELAWARE M&P	1	0	2	3	3	1	3	7	10.5	212,604
FLORIDA ¹ M&P	0	105	27	132	26	26	79.0	1,966,547
GEORGIA M ²	86	0	0	86	21	0	0	21	101.0	2,403,110
HAWAII ³ M&P	293,200
ILLINOIS M&P	208	21	101	330	15	4	2	21	122.0	4,359,261
INDIANA M&P	48	7	74	129	20	6	1	27	85.0	1,652,715
IOWA M&P	136	6	0	142	105	5	6	116	34.0	1,010,902
KANSAS M&P	141	5	5	151	12	1	0	13	51.0	1,282,247
LOUISIANA M&P	84	5	1	90	42	0	0	42	68.0	1,754,579
MISSISSIPPI M&P	36	0	15	51	18	4	0	22	44.0	1,098,002
MONTANA M&P	22	0	15	37	87	31	20	138	15.0	341,039
NEW MEXICO M&P	38	0	0	38	13	0	0	13	15.0	418,650
NORTH CAROLINA M&P	156	10	0	166	41	0	0	41	125.0	2,847,709
OHIO M&P	151	17	91	259	58	14	1	73	133.0	4,616,502
OKLAHOMA M&P	63	3	22	88	60	0	0	60	68.0	1,616,065
SOUTH CAROLINA M&P	43	9	56	108	0	0	0	0	49.0	1,131,972
SOUTH DAKOTA M ²	53	0	0	53	51	0	0	51	21.0	479,771
TEXAS M&P	256	12	78	346	131	4	11	146	213.0	4,622,924
UTAH M&P	29	0	8	37	48	2	0	50	29.3	770,926
VERMONT M&P	16	1	1	18	12	2	0	14	14.2	283,578
VIRGINIA M&P	24	3	4	31	136	0	2	138	42.0	1,292,494
WEST VIRGINIA M&P	30	0	0	30	42	0	0	42	26.0	597,101
WISCONSIN M&P	155	10	113	278	56	3	13	72	85.0	2,983,403

TABLE 1.—STATE INSPECTION PROGRAMS—Continued

	Regular plants			Total	Custom exempt plants				Full time equivalent staff years	FY 1996 federal assistance
	Meat	Poultry	Meat and poultry		Meat	Poultry	Meat and Poultry	Total		
WYOMING M&P	31	0	0	31	29	0	0	29	7.5	283,805
TOTAL	1,947	221	624	2,792	1,074	77	59	1,210	1,482.8	40,519,025
CALIFORNIA ¹								306		147,697
MINNESOTA ⁴								298		110,348

¹ FY 1995 figures. FY 1996 figures not available at this time.

² Poultry Program is under Federal jurisdiction.

³ The Hawaii Program was designated November 1, 1995 so other statistics are not available.

⁴ Official plants are under Federal jurisdiction. Custom exempt facilities are reviewed under State contract.

*All Federal assistance amounts are estimates.

Table 2 lists the dates the Department assumed inspection of meat and poultry products for intrastate sale in designated States as of September 28, 1996. All plants in designated States come under Federal inspection and their products can be sold in interstate commerce.

TABLE 2.—DATES USDA ASSUMED INTRASTATE INSPECTION

State	Meat	Poultry
Arkansas	06/01/81	01/02/71
California	04/01/76	04/01/76
Colorado	07/01/75	01/02/71
Connecticut	10/01/75	10/01/75
Georgia	(¹)	01/02/71
Hawaii	11/01/95	11/01/95
Idaho	07/01/81	01/02/71

TABLE 2.—DATES USDA ASSUMED INTRASTATE INSPECTION—Continued

State	Meat	Poultry
Kentucky	01/14/72	07/28/71
Maine	05/12/80	01/02/71
Maryland	04/01/91	04/01/91
Massachusetts	01/12/76	01/12/76
Michigan	10/03/81	01/02/71
Minnesota	05/16/71	01/02/71
Missouri	08/18/72	08/18/72
Nebraska	10/01/71	07/28/71
Nevada	07/01/73	07/01/73
New Hampshire	08/07/78	08/07/78
New Jersey	07/01/75	07/01/75
New York	07/16/75	04/11/77
North Dakota	06/22/70	01/02/71
Oregon	07/01/72	01/02/71
Pennsylvania	07/17/72	10/31/71

TABLE 2.—DATES USDA ASSUMED INTRASTATE INSPECTION—Continued

State	Meat	Poultry
Rhode Island	10/01/81	10/01/81
South Dakota	(¹)	01/02/71
Tennessee	10/01/75	10/01/75
Washington	06/01/73	06/01/73

(¹) Indicates USDA has not assumed meat inspection in the State shown.

Table 3 lists the number of meat, poultry, and other plants inspected under Federal-State Cooperative Inspection Program (FSCIP) agreements as of September 28, 1996. FSCIP agreements permit State employees to carry out inspection in federally inspected plants.

TABLE 3.—FEDERAL-STATE COOPERATIVE INSPECTION PLANTS (FORMERLY TALMADGE-AIKEN)

State	Meat plants	Poultry plants	Meat and poultry plants	Sub total	Other plants	Grand total
Alabama	20	0	0	20	0	20
Georgia	11	0	41	52	0	52
Illinois	18	2	10	30	0	30
Mississippi	5	0	14	19	0	19
North Carolina	51	3	0	54	0	54
Oklahoma	13	0	1	14	0	14
Texas	7	1	14	22	0	22
Utah	8	0	5	13	0	13
Virginia	9	1	21	31	0	31
Total	142	7	106	255	0	255

[FR Doc. 97-15124 Filed 6-5-97; 1:51 pm]

BILLING CODE 3410-DM-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A-427-801, A-428-801, A-475-801, A-588-804, A-485-801, A-559-801, A-401-801, A-412-801]

Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden and the United Kingdom; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Partial Termination of Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and partial termination of administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from interested parties, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof (AFBs) from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The classes or kinds of merchandise covered by these orders are ball bearings and parts thereof (BBs), cylindrical roller bearings and parts thereof (CRBs), and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof (SPBs). The reviews cover 21 manufacturers/exporters. The period of review (the POR) is May 1, 1995, through April 30, 1996.

We are terminating the reviews for five other manufacturers/exporters because the requests for reviews were withdrawn in a timely manner.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value (NV) by various companies subject to these reviews. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of these administrative reviews, we will instruct U.S. Customs 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: June 10, 1997.

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

France

Chip Hayes (SKF), Lyn Johnson (SNFA), Michael Panfeld (SNR), Kris Campbell, or Richard Rimlinger.

Germany

Thomas Barlow (Torrington Nadellager), J. David Dirstine (SKF), Suzanne Flood (INA), Michael Panfeld (NTN Kugellagerfabrik), Thomas Schauer (FAG), Kris Campbell, or Richard Rimlinger.

Italy

Chip Hayes (SKF), Mark Ross (FAG), or Richard Rimlinger.

Japan

J. David Dirstine (Koyo Seiko), Charles Riggle (NTN), Matthew Rosenbaum (NPBS), Thomas Schauer (NSK Ltd., Nachi-Fujikoshi Corp.), Kris Campbell, or Richard Rimlinger.

Romania

Thomas Barlow (Tehnoimportexport, S.A.) or Kris Campbell.

Singapore

Lyn Johnson (NMB/Pelmec) or Richard Rimlinger.

Sweden

Mark Ross (SKF) or Richard Rimlinger.

United Kingdom

Hermes Pinilla (FAG, Barden, NSK/RHP) or Kris Campbell.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the current regulations as amended by the interim regulations published in the **Federal Register** on May 11, 1995 (60 FR 25130).

Background

On May 15, 1989, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (54 FR 20909) the antidumping duty orders

on BBs, CRBs, and SPBs from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. Specifically, these orders cover BBs, CRBs, and SPBs from France, Germany, and Japan; BBs and CRBs from Italy, Sweden and the U.K.; and BBs from Romania, Thailand and Singapore. On June 20, 1996, in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.22(c), we published a notice of initiation of administrative reviews of certain of these orders for the period May 1, 1995, through April 30, 1996 (61 FR 31506). Subsequently, on July 30, 1996, we published an amendment to our initiation notice which, *inter alia*, terminated the review with respect to BBs from Thailand and conditionally initiated reviews for all other exporters of BBs from Romania in addition to Tehnoimportexport (61 FR 39629). The Department is now conducting these administrative reviews in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act.

Subsequent to the initiation of these reviews, we received timely withdrawals of review requests for Meter S.p.A. (Italy), Asahi Seiko (Japan), Izumoto Seiko Co., Ltd. (Japan), Kohwa Technos Corp. (Japan), and Sanwa Kizai Co., Ltd. (Japan). Because there were no other requests for review of these companies from any other interested parties, we are terminating the reviews with respect to these companies in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.22(a)(5).

Scope of Reviews

The products covered by these reviews are AFBs and constitute the following classes or kinds of merchandise:

1. Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof:

These products include all antifriction bearings 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 (HTS) 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, 8482.99.10, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.6590, 8482.99.70, 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,