

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

## International Trade Administration

[A-588-604]

**Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Tapered Roller Bearings, Over Four Inches, and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From Japan**

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

**ACTION:** Notice of Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Tapered Roller Bearings, Over Four Inches, and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from Japan.

**SUMMARY:** On April 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on tapered roller bearings from Japan (64 FR 15727) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response (in this case, a waiver) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Darla D. Brown or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482-3207 or (202) 482-1560, respectively.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 4, 1999.

**Statute and Regulations**

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("Sunset Regulations") and 19 CFR 351 (1998) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders; Policy*

*Bulletin*, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("Sunset Policy Bulletin").

**Scope**

The merchandise subject to this antidumping order is tapered roller bearings ("TRBs") and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, which are 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. Products subject to the finding on TRBs, four inches or less in outside diameter (A-588-054) are not included in the scope of this order, except for those manufactured by NTN Corporation. The subject merchandise is currently classifiable under HTS items 8482.20.20, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.30, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.60, and 8484.30.80. While the HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description remains dispositive.

The Department has made two scope rulings with respect to the order. In the first ruling, the Department ruled that green rings which had not been heat-treated are within the scope of the order.<sup>1</sup> The Department also ruled that Koyo's rough forgings, including hot forgings, cold forgings, and tower forgings are within the scope of the order.<sup>2</sup>

**History of the Order**

On August 17, 1987, the Department published its final determination of sales at less than fair value ("LTFV") with respect to TRBs from Japan (52 FR 30700). The Department published the antidumping duty order on October 6, 1987 (52 FR 37352).

Over the life of the order, the Department has conducted several administrative reviews.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See unpublished scope ruling dated May 16, 1989.

<sup>2</sup> See *Final Affirmative Determination in Scope Inquiry on Antidumping Duty Order on Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan*, 60 FR 6519 (February 2, 1995).

<sup>3</sup> See *Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof, from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 56 FR 41508 (August 21, 1991); *Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof, from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 4951 (February 11, 1992); *Tapered Roller Bearings, and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 4960 (February 11, 1992); as amended, *Tapered Roller Bearings, and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from Japan; Amendment to Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 57 FR 9104 (March 16, 1992); *Final Results of Antidumping Duty*

This sunset review covers imports from all known Japanese producers/exporters.

The Department made a duty absorption finding in the final results of the 1995-96 administrative review.<sup>4</sup>

**Background**

On April 1, 1999, the Department initiated a sunset review of the antidumping order on TRBs from Japan (64 FR 15727), pursuant to section 751(c) of the Act. The Department received notices of intent to participate on behalf of the Timken Company ("Timken") and the Torrington

*Administrative Reviews; 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*, 58 FR 64720 (December 9, 1993); as amended, *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*, 59 FR 2594 (January 18, 1994); *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished or Unfinished, from Japan; Affirmation of the Results of Redetermination Pursuant to Court Remand*, 59 FR 23828 (May 9, 1994); *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; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation Unfinished, from Japan in Part of an Antidumping Finding*, 61 FR 57629 (November 7, 1996); *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; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Termination in Part*, 62 FR 11825 (March 13, 1997); *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 63 FR 2558 (January 15, 1998); as amended, *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; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 63 FR 13391 (March 19, 1998); *Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Finished and Unfinished, and Parts Thereof, from Japan; Final Court Decisions and Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 63 FR 17815 (April 10, 1998); *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; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Termination in Part*, 63 FR 20585 (April 27, 1998); *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; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 63 FR 63860 (November 17, 1998).

<sup>4</sup> See *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 63 FR 2558 (January 15, 1998).

Company ("Torrington"), American NTN Bearing Manufacturing Corporation ("ANBM") and the NTN Bower Corporation, and Koyo Corporation of the U.S.A.—Manufacturing Division ("KCUM") on April 16, 1999, within the deadline specified in section 351.218(d)(1)(i) of the *Sunset Regulations*. We received complete substantive responses on behalf of Timken and Torrington, ANBM and NTN Bower, and KCUM on May 3, 1999, within the 30-day deadline specified in the *Sunset Regulations* under section 351.218(d)(3)(i).

Timken and Torrington claimed interested party status under 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)(C) as U.S. manufacturers of TRBs. Timken stated that it filed the original petition that led to the antidumping order. In addition, Timken stated that it has participated in all administrative reviews of the order. Torrington, however, stated that it did not participate in the original investigation nor any of the administrative reviews. ANBM and NTN Bower also claimed interested party status under 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)(C) as U.S. manufacturers of a domestic like product. Additionally, ANBM and NTN Bower stated that they are related to a foreign producer/exporter and are importers of subject merchandise. ANBM and/or NTN Bower state that they have participated in every administrative review of the order, with the exception of the 1994–95 annual review. KCUM also claimed interested party status under 19 U.S.C. 1677(9)(C) as a U.S. manufacturer of a domestic like product. KCUM stated that it is a division of Koyo Corporation of U.S.A., a wholly-owned subsidiary of Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd., a producer in Japan of subject merchandise and an importer of subject merchandise. Moreover, KCUM stated that it has participated in all administrative reviews conducted by the Department.

On May 3, 1999, the Department received a waiver from Koyo Seiko Corp., Ltd. As a result, pursuant to 19 CFR 351.218(e)(1)(ii)(C), the Department determined to conduct an expedited, 120-day, review of this order.

On May 12, 1999, the Department received rebuttal comments from ANBM and NTN Bower and Timken and Torrington.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>5</sup> On May 6, 1999, the Department received and granted a request from Timken and Torrington for a two working-day extension of the deadline for filing rebuttal comments in this sunset review. This extension was granted for all participants eligible to file rebuttal comments in this review. The deadline for filing rebuttals to the substantive comments therefore became May 12, 1999.

In accordance with section 751(c)(5)(C)(v) of the Act, the Department may treat a review as extraordinarily complicated if it is a review of a transition order (*i.e.*, an order in effect on January 1, 1995). On August 5, 1999, the Department determined that the sunset review of the antidumping duty order on TRBs from Japan is extraordinarily complicated, and extended the time limit for completion of the final results of this review until not later than October 28, 1999, in accordance with section 751(c)(5)(B) of the Act.<sup>6</sup>

#### Determination

In accordance with section 751(c)(1) of the Act, the Department conducted this review to determine whether revocation of the antidumping order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping. Section 752(c) of the Act provides that, in making this determination, the Department shall consider the weighted-average dumping margins determined in the investigation and subsequent reviews and the volume of imports of the subject merchandise for the period before and the period after the issuance of the antidumping order, and shall provide to the International Trade Commission ("the Commission") the magnitude of the margin of dumping likely to prevail if the order is revoked.

The Department's determinations concerning continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are discussed below. In addition, interested parties' comments with respect to continuation or recurrence of dumping and the magnitude of the margin are addressed within the respective sections below.

#### Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Drawing on the guidance provided in the legislative history accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act ("URAA"), specifically the Statement of Administrative Action ("the SAA"), H.R. Doc. No. 103–316, vol. 1 (1994), the House Report, H.R. Rep. No. 103–826, pt. 1 (1994), and the Senate Report, S. Rep. No. 103–412 (1994), the Department issued its *Sunset Policy Bulletin* providing guidance on methodological and analytical issues, including the bases for likelihood determinations. In its *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department indicated that determinations of likelihood will be made on an order-wide basis (*see*

<sup>6</sup> *See Tapered Roller Bearings, 4 Inches and Under From Japan, et al.; Extension of Time Limit for Final Results of Five-Year Reviews*, 64 FR 42672 (August 5, 1999).

section II.A.3). In addition, the Department indicated that normally it will determine that revocation of an antidumping order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where (a) dumping continued at any level above de minimis after the issuance of the order, (b) imports of the subject merchandise ceased after the issuance of the order, or (c) dumping was eliminated after the issuance of the order and import volumes for the subject merchandise declined significantly (*see* section II.A.3).

In addition to considering the guidance on likelihood cited above, section 751(c)(4)(B) of the Act provides that the Department shall determine that revocation of an order is likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping where a respondent interested party waives its participation in the sunset review. In this instant review, the Department received a waiver from Koyo and did not receive a substantive response from any other respondent interested party. Pursuant to section 351.218(d)(2)(iii) of the *Sunset Regulations*, this constitutes a waiver of participation.

In their substantive response, Timken and Torrington argue that revocation of the order on TRBs from Japan would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping due, in part, to the fact that there has been continuous dumping of subject TRBs for more than twelve years (*see* May 3, 1999, substantive response of Timken and Torrington at 8). Timken and Torrington further argue that the Asian financial and economic crisis has had the effect of limiting the market for TRBs in Japan and the rest of Asia, leaving Japanese TRB producers with excess capacity and the need to export more than they have in the past, specifically to non-Asian countries. Timken and Torrington maintain that the result of the Asian crisis has been a forty percent increase of exports of TRBs to the U.S. from 1997 to 1998 (*see id.* at 12). Moreover, Timken and Torrington argue that Japanese selling patterns in such non-Asian countries as Canada and Mexico indicate that absent the order, Japanese producers would increase exports to the U.S. by lowering prices. Timken and Torrington conclude that since the Japanese are presently selling in the U.S. at LTFV, even lower prices would mean greater levels of dumping (*see id.* at 13). In sum, Timken and Torrington argue that the consistent history of dumping with the discipline of the order in place, together with the impact of the Asian crisis and Japanese sales activity in other countries demonstrate

that dumping would continue or recur if the order were revoked.

In their substantive response, ANBM and NTN Bower (collectively, "NTN") argue that revocation of the order would have minimal, or no, impact upon the U.S. market for the following reasons. First, they maintain that producers in Japan have invested in production facilities in the U.S. since the imposition of the order, thereby decreasing the need to import subject merchandise from Japan. They further claim that imports from non-subject countries will continue to increase, therefore reducing the competitive threat from the subject country to the U.S. market. Finally, they argue that the U.S. bearing industry is financially secure (see May 3, 1999, substantive response of NTN at 3).

KCUM, in its substantive response, argues that revocation of the antidumping order would not have much of an effect on the U.S. market, prices, or the industry for two reasons. First, KCUM maintains that the U.S. market and the role of imports in the market have changed substantially over the past twenty years, and foreign producers whose imports have been subject to the order have moved substantial production facilities to the U.S. Therefore, KCUM argues, if the order is revoked, KCUM will continue to produce significant quantities of bearings in the U.S. because companies would not abandon their U.S. production facilities solely in response to the revocation of the order. Second, KCUM argues that foreign producers subject to the order have much smaller market shares with limited ability to influence prices in the market. The conclusion KCUM draws is that the TRB market in the U.S. is subject to conditions that affect prices to which the existence or revocation of the antidumping order is irrelevant (see May 3, 1999, substantive response of KCUM at 4-5).

In their rebuttal comments, Timken and Torrington maintain that the existence of manufacturing facilities in the U.S. is not relevant to the likelihood determination because despite the fact that such facilities have been in operation for many years, dumping of subject merchandise from Japan in substantial amounts has continued for many years (see May 12, 1999, rebuttal of Timken and Torrington at 3-4). Timken and Torrington further argue that any significant effect that onshore production was going to have on dumped imports would have demonstrated itself by now (see *id.* at 5). Moreover, Timken and Torrington rebut NTN's assertion that revocation will not

have any effect because non-subject imports of TRBs will increase. Timken and Torrington argue that there is no evidence that, should the order be revoked, NTN or any other Japanese producer would raise its import prices. Timken and Torrington maintain that since Japanese producers currently sell at LTFV prices or lower, there is little likelihood that foreign producers of non-subject merchandise would be able to increase their market share (see *id.* at 5). Finally, Timken and Torrington rebut KCUM's argument that the U.S. market and the role of imports in the market have changed substantially over the past twenty years. Timken and Torrington maintain that since KCUM does not affirm that market conditions will change in any significant way, on the surface, KCUM's assertion supports the proposition that dumping will continue if the order were revoked because dumping occurs at present (see *id.* at 4-5).

NTN, in its rebuttal, argues that Timken and Torrington rely heavily on the assumption that the Asian economic situation will continue as it has for the foreseeable future. NTN, however, states that more recent economic trends indicate that the Japanese, and Asian, economies are on the verge of recovery (see May 12, 1999, rebuttal of NTN at 2). Finally, NTN maintains that Timken and Torrington also heavily rely on the duty absorption rates in arguing likely dumping levels. However, NTN points out that the rates cited by Timken and Torrington, as well as the order of duty absorption itself, are the subject of litigation before the Court of International Trade (see *id.* at 2).

The Department agrees, based on an examination of the final results of administrative reviews, that dumping margins above de minimis levels have continued throughout the life of the order for at least one Japanese producer/exporter.<sup>7</sup> As discussed in section II.A.3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the SAA at 890, and the House Report at 63-64, if companies continue dumping with the discipline of an order in place, the Department may reasonably infer that dumping would continue if the discipline were removed. The Department also agrees that imports of the subject merchandise have continued throughout the life of the order. Since the imposition of the order, imports of TRBs from Japan have fluctuated greatly, showing no overall trend.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>7</sup> See footnote 3.

<sup>8</sup> The Department bases this determination on information submitted by Timken and Torrington in its May 3, 1999, submission, as well as U.S. IM146 Reports, U.S. Department of Commerce statistics,

Based on this analysis, the Department finds that the existence of dumping margins after the issuance of the order is highly probative of the likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping. A deposit rate above a de minimis level continues in effect for exports of the subject merchandise for at least one known Japan producer/exporter. Therefore, given that dumping has continued over the life of the order and respondent interested parties waived their right to participate in this review before the Department, we determine that dumping is likely to continue or recur if the order were revoked. Whatever relevance the arguments of those parties in support of revocation might have had concerning possible disincentives for producers and/or exporters to dump in the U.S. market, those arguments are mooted by the evidence that dumping continues and has continued over the life of the order.

#### Magnitude of the Margin

In the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department stated that it will normally provide to the Commission the margin that was determined in the final determination in the original investigation. Further, for companies not specifically investigated or for companies that did not begin shipping until after the order was issued, the Department normally will provide a margin based on the "all others" rate from the investigation. (See section II.B.1 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.) Exceptions to this policy include the use of a more recently calculated margin, where appropriate, and consideration of duty absorption determinations. (See sections II.B.2 and 3 of the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*.)

In their substantive response, Timken and Torrington suggest that the Department deviate from its general practice of selecting the margins from the original investigation due to the fact that two major Japanese producers were found to be absorbing duties (see May 3, 1999, substantive response of Timken and Torrington at 18). Timken and Torrington also point out that where the Department has found duty absorption, for companies that were absorbing duties, it will report the greater of the margin it would normally report or the most recent margin for that company adjusted to account for the Department's findings on duty absorption (see *id.* at 16 and *Sunset Policy Bulletin*). In sum, Timken and Torrington recommend that

U.S. Department of Treasury statistics, and information obtained from the U.S. International Trade Commission.

if the Department conducts an expedited review, it should rely on the evidence from the 1995–96 administrative review and forward the margins, as adjusted for duty absorption, for the companies from this review (*see id.* at 17).

NTN, in its substantive response, maintains that the dumping margin likely to prevail if the order were revoked is 0.00 percent. However, NTN alternatively requests that the Department employ margins that were determined during one of the more recent administrative reviews of the subject merchandise (*see* May 3, 1999, substantive response of NTN at 3–4).

In its substantive response, KCUM states that it cannot predict the likely effect of revocation of the order since the existence of the order does not have much of an effect on the prices at which bearings are sold in the United States, and, hence, on the margins generated on those sales (*see* May 3, 1999, substantive response of KCUM at 5). Moreover, KCUM argues that fluctuations in the exchange rate between the dollar and the Japanese yen have a significant impact on dumping margins (*see id.* at 6). They argue that the results of past administrative reviews reveal that antidumping margins tend to increase in periods in which the yen appreciates against the dollar and vice versa. As a result, KCUM argues, the margins that would prevail if the order were revoked cannot be determined because they are dependent on an entirely exogenous factor (*see id.* at 6). In any case, KCUM strenuously objects to the use of the margins calculated in the LTFV determination, arguing that the order is hopelessly obsolete and cannot serve as a realistic indicator of the market and pricing conditions that would exist today if the order were revoked (*see id.* at 6). Therefore, KCUM concludes that the Department should use the results of more recent administrative reviews when determining the margins that would exist for Koyo (*see id.* at 7).

As noted above, the Department determined in the final results of the 1995–96 administrative review that two Japanese producers/exporters, Koyo Seiko and NSK, were absorbing duties.<sup>9</sup> Consistent with the statute and the *Sunset Policy Bulletin*, the Department will notify the Commission of its findings regarding duty absorption when conducting a sunset review.

Additionally, the *Sunset Policy Bulletin* refers to the SAA at 885 and the House Report at 60, and provides that where the Department has found duty absorption, the Department normally will report to the Commission the higher of the margin that the Department otherwise would have reported or the most recent margin for that company, adjusted to account for the Department's findings on duty absorption.

In this case, the margins adjusted to account for the Department's duty absorption findings are less than the margins we would otherwise report to the Commission. As such, the Department will report to the Commission the company-specific and "all others" rates from the original investigation as contained in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

#### Final Results of Review

As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would likely lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the margins listed below:

Manufacturer/ Exporter	Margin (percent)
Koyo Seiko Co., Ltd. ....	70.44
NTN Toyo Bearing Co., Ltd. ....	47.05
All Others .....	47.57

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order ("APO") of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305 of the Department's regulations. Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

This five-year ("sunset") review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(c), 752, and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 28, 1999.

**Richard W. Moreland,**

*Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 99–28767 Filed 11–3–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### International Trade Administration

[A–485–602]

#### Final Results of Expedited Sunset Review: Tapered Roller Bearings From Romania

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of expedited sunset review: tapered roller bearings from Romania.

**SUMMARY:** On April 1, 1999, the Department of Commerce ("the Department") initiated a sunset review of the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings from Romania (64 FR 15727) pursuant to section 751(c) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended ("the Act"). On the basis of a notice of intent to participate and adequate substantive comments filed on behalf of domestic interested parties and inadequate response (in this case, a waiver) from respondent interested parties, the Department determined to conduct an expedited review. As a result of this review, the Department finds that revocation of the antidumping duty order would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping at the levels indicated in the Final Results of Review section of this notice.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Darla D. Brown or Melissa G. Skinner, Office of Policy for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–3207 or (202) 482–1560, respectively.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** November 4, 1999.

#### Statute and Regulations

This review was conducted pursuant to sections 751(c) and 752 of the Act. The Department's procedures for the conduct of sunset reviews are set forth in *Procedures for Conducting Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*, 63 FR 13516 (March 20, 1998) ("Sunset Regulations") and 19 CFR Part 351 (1998) in general. Guidance on methodological or analytical issues relevant to the Department's conduct of sunset reviews is set forth in the Department's Policy Bulletin 98:3—*Policies Regarding the Conduct of Five-year ("Sunset") Reviews of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Orders*; Policy Bulletin, 63 FR 18871 (April 16, 1998) ("Sunset Policy Bulletin").

<sup>9</sup> See *Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, from Japan, and Tapered Roller Bearings, Four Inches or Less in Outside Diameter, and Components Thereof, from Japan*; *Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews*, 63 FR 2558 (January 15, 1998).