

adhered to the proposition that each administrative review is a separate and distinct proceeding and that, while Department practice is helpful and instructive in succeeding reviews, it is not binding. Finally, FAG Germany and FAG Italy contend that Torrington's request would place a burden on respondents by making them recite the history of each adjustment permitted or rejected over all previous reviews. FAG Italy and FAG Germany state that such a burden would be overwhelming and unnecessary.

Department's Position: We disagree with Torrington that we should require that all respondents conform their submissions, their allocations, and their methodology to our most recent prior determinations and rulings. We also disagree with Torrington that respondents should identify where they have continued to use any methodology that we rejected in a prior review and justify the departure from established practice. Each administrative review is a separate reviewable segment of the proceeding involving different sales, adjustments, and underlying facts. What transpired in previous reviews is not binding precedent in later reviews, and parties are entitled, at the risk of the Department's determining otherwise, to argue against a prior Department determination. As a practical matter, methodologies the Department accepts in one review are generally used by respondents in subsequent reviews and methodologies the Department rejects are not perpetuated in later reviews. The Department, however, may reconsider its position on an issue during the course of the proceeding in light of facts and arguments presented by the parties.

D. Country of Origin. Comment 1: Torrington claims that SKF Germany did not disclose its methodology for determining country of origin after the Department asked it in its supplemental questionnaire to do so. Torrington claims that SKF Germany asserted in its supplemental questionnaire response that its methodology had not changed over the past reviews, but that it did not indicate the product's essential characteristics for purposes of determining country of origin. In addition, Torrington contends that SKF Germany did not indicate what manufacturing steps convey origin, and SKF Germany did not indicate the methodology which it has consistently applied. Torrington argues further that SKF Germany does not describe how it arrived at its origin determination. Torrington asserts that if the company cannot clear up these questions the Department should conclude that it is unable to determine whether SKF

Germany has reported all sales of German bearings in its HM and U.S. sales listings and apply facts available. Torrington suggests that an appropriate facts available solution would be to apply the highest margin found for any SKF company in this review.

SKF Germany contends that, as it stated in its questionnaire and supplemental questionnaire responses, it considers the complexity and extent of the manufacturing processes involved and the origin of each bearing's major components when identifying country of origin for its bearings. SKF Germany claims that the accurate determination of origin is important to the proper reporting of its sales in an administrative review and in order to comply with European and United States marking and other requirements. SKF Germany contends further that in multiple prior verifications the Department has confirmed the accuracy and completeness of SKF Germany's sales reporting. In addition, SKF Germany claims that, in this review, the Department also affirmed the accuracy of its sales reporting, including a description of the specific steps taken at verification to confirm SKF's origin determinations. SKF Germany contends that, as the Department verified, it reported sales of all German origin bearings.

Department's Position: We agree with SKF Germany. We are satisfied that SKF Germany reported all of its German-origin bearings and did not report sales of non-German origin bearings in this review. We verified, in this review, SKF Germany's methodology and were able to trace the procedure that SKF Germany uses in determining the country of origin for its bearings. We did not find any discrepancies in SKF Germany's reporting methodology in our examination of invoices, inventory records, and sales registers.

Comment 2: Torrington argues that the Department should confirm that NSK-RHP has determined the country of origin properly for all reported bearings. Torrington asserts that NSK-RHP did not answer fully a question that the Department asked in its supplemental questionnaire on the country of origin of bearings NSK-RHP sold in or to the U.S. market. Torrington contends that NSK-RHP did not clarify how it determines whether a bearing is a U.K.-produced (versus a Japanese-produced) bearing in its supplemental response. For these reasons, Torrington requests that Department consider applying facts available for these final results. Torrington also suggests that an appropriate facts-available solution would be to apply the highest margin

found for any NSK-related company for this review period.

NSK-RHP argues that it only sold RHP-brand bearings in, or to, the United States during the POR. Further, NSK-RHP asserts that almost all of these bearings were produced at factories owned and controlled by RHP Bearings, Ltd. NSK-RHP maintains that the few remaining RHP-brand bearings manufactured by NSK Bearings Europe were sold in the United States during the sample weeks. NSK-RHP argues that NSK-brand bearings manufactured by NSK Bearings Europe were not sold in, or to, the United States during the review period. Moreover, NSK-RHP argues that it has already reported the degree to which affiliated companies provided raw materials or components either to RHP Bearings, NSK Bearings Europe, or both, during the POR. Therefore, NSK-RHP asserts, an examination of this material demonstrates that bearings manufactured in Japan were not reported as U.K. merchandise.

Department's Position: We disagree with Torrington. We addressed the question in our supplemental questionnaire in relation to NSK-RHP's further-manufactured sales. NSK-RHP reported these sales as being of U.K. origin. There is nothing on the record that suggests these sales are not of U.K. origin and Torrington has not provided any evidence to suggest otherwise. Furthermore, we have examined NSK-RHP's methodology for reporting its bearings and are satisfied that NSK-RHP properly determined the country of origin of all reported bearings.

[FR Doc. 97-923 Filed 1-14-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-428-801]

Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from Germany: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

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

SUMMARY: On January 6, 1997, the Department of Commerce (The Department) issued the final results of administrative review of the antidumping duty orders on Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan,

Singapore, and the United Kingdom, which has not yet been published in the Federal Register.

The classes or kinds of merchandise covered by these reviews are ball bearings and parts thereof, cylindrical roller bearings and parts thereof, and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof. The reviews cover 27 manufacturers/exporters. The review period is May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995. We are correcting a margin-rate error with respect to ball bearings from Germany manufactured/exported by FAG KGS.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 15, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Thomas Schauer or Richard Rimlinger, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-4733.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On January 6, 1997, the Department of Commerce (The Department) issued the notice of final results of administrative review of the antidumping duty orders on Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, and the United Kingdom, which has not yet been published in the Federal Register. The classes or kinds of merchandise covered by these reviews are ball bearings and parts thereof, cylindrical roller bearings and parts thereof, and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof. The reviews cover 27 manufacturers/exporters. The review period is May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995.

After issuance of our final results, we realized that we did not publish the correct margin we calculated for the final results with respect to ball bearings

from Germany manufactured and exported by FAG.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (as amended) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, 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).

Amended Final Results of Review

We have determined the following weighted-average margin to exist for the period May 1, 1994 through April 30, 1995:

| Country | Company | Class or kind | Rate |
|---------------|-----------|---------------------|--------|
| Germany | FAG | Ball Bearings | 13.48% |

A cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties based on the above margin shall be effective upon publication of this notice of amended final results of administrative review for all shipments entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (as amended). This deposit requirement shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective orders (APO) of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 353.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

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

Dated: January 10, 1997.

Robert S. LaRussa,
Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.
[FR Doc. 97-994 Filed 1-14-97; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-549-502]

Certain Circular Welded Carbon Steel Pipes and Tubes from Thailand: Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: On November 1, 1996, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand (61 FR 56515). This review covers Saha Thai Steel Pipe Company, SAF Steel Pipe Export Company, and Pacific Pipe Company.¹ The period of review (POR) is March 1, 1994 through February 28, 1995.

On October 31, 1996, counsel for the petitioning companies Allied Tube & Conduit Corporation, Sawhill Tubular Division of Armco, Inc., American Tube

Company, Inc., Laclede Steel Company, Sharon Tube Company, Wheatland Tube Company, and Eagle Pipe ("petitioners") filed timely allegations, pursuant to 19 CFR 353.28, of ministerial and clerical errors with regard to the final results in the 1994-95 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain circular welded carbon steel pipes and tubes from Thailand. Petitioners' allegations were limited to alleged errors in calculating the dumping margin for subject merchandise manufactured by Saha Thai. On November 20, 1996, Saha Thai also submitted timely allegations of clerical errors. Saha Thai did not comment on the allegations submitted by petitioners.

EFFECTIVE DATE: January 15, 1997.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James Rice or Jean Kemp, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 9, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-0162 or (202) 482-4037, respectively.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act) by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. In addition, unless otherwise indicated,

¹ The Department has determined that Pacific Pipe Company had no U.S. sales during the period of review.