the extent that the Department makes an affirmative countervailing duty determination with respect to such programs and with respect to the exporters or producers subject to the sunset review. The SAA at 889, states that,

> [S]ubsidy allegations normally should be made in the context of [administrative] reviews * * *, and [the Department is not expected] to entertain frivolous allegations in . . . [sunset] reviews. However, where there have been no recent [administrative] reviews or where the alleged countervailable subsidy program came into existence after the most recently completed [administrative] review, [the Department] may consider new subsidy allegations in the context of a * * * [sunset] review.

Therefore, the Department will consider programs newly alleged to provide countervailable subsidies if the Department determines that good cause to consider such programs exists. Furthermore, the Department normally will consider a new subsidy allegation in the context of a sunset review only where information on such program was not reasonably available to domestic interested parties during the most recently completed administrative review or the alleged countervailable subsidy program came into existence after that administrative review. The burden is on interested parties to provide information or evidence that would warrant consideration of the subsidy program in question. In addition, with respect to a sunset review of a suspended investigation, where the Department determines that good cause exists, the Department normally will conduct the sunset review consistent with its practice of examining likelihood under section 751(a) of the Act.

[FR Doc. 98–10039 Filed 4–15–98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 3510–DS–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–549–801, A–412–801]

Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al.; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews

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

ACTION: Notice of final court decision and amended final results of administrative reviews.

SUMMARY: On December 12, 1996, the United States Court of International Trade affirmed the Department of Commerce's final remand results affecting final assessment rates for the third administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. 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. As there is now a final and conclusive court decision in these actions (with the exceptions of SKF GmbH, SKF Industrie S.p.A. and SKF Sverige AB which have filed appeals to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit), we are amending our final results of reviews and we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to these reviews with the exception of those still under appeal.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Greg Thompson or Jay Biggs, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–0410 or (202) 482–1690.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act), are references to the provisions in effect as of December 31, 1994. In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations as codified at 19 CFR Part 353 (April 1, 1997).

Background

On July 26, 1993, the Department published its final results of administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom, covering the period May 1, 1991 through April 30, 1992 (*AFBs III*) (58 FR 39729). These final results were amended on August 9, 1993, September 30, 1993, December 15, 1993 and February 28, 1994 (*see* 58 FR 42288, 58 FR 51055, 58 FR 65576 and 59 FR 9469, respectively). The classes or kinds of merchandise covered by these reviews are ball bearings and parts thereof (BBs), cylindrical roller bearings and parts thereof (CRBs), and spherical plain bearings and parts thereof (SPBs). Subsequently, two domestic producers, the Torrington Company and Federal-Mogul, and a number of other interested parties filed lawsuits with the U.S. Court of International Trade (CIT) challenging the final results. These lawsuits were litigated at the CIT and the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC). In the course of this litigation, the CIT and CAFC issued a number of orders and opinions, of which the following have resulted in changes to the antidumping margins calculated in AFBs III:

Federal-Mogul Corporation and the Torrington Company v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–37, (February 13, 1996) with respect to France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom;

Koyo Seiko Co. v. *United States*, Fed. Cir. Nos. 93–1525, 93–1534 (September 30, 1994) with respect to Japan;

NSK Ltd. and NSK Corporation v. *United States*, Slip Op. 94–175 (November 14, 1994) with respect to Japan;

NSK Ltd. and NSK Corporation v. *United States*, Slip Op. 94–181 (November 28, 1994) with respect to Japan;

NSK Ltd. v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–125 (August 5, 1996) with respect to Japan;

SKF USA Inc. v. *United States*, Slip Op. 95–82 (May 4, 1995) with respect to Italy;

SKF USA Inc. v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–13 (January 10, 1996) with respect to France;

SKF USA Inc. v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–15 (January 16, 1996) with respect to Italy;

SKF USA Inc. v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–16 (January 16, 1996) with respect to Sweden;

FAG Kugelfischer Georg Schafer KgaA., FAG Italia S.p.A, FAG (U.K.) Limited, Barden Corporation Limited, FAG Bearings Corporation and The Barden Corporation v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–108 (July 10, 1996) with respect to Italy, Germany, and the United Kingdom;

INA Walzlager Schaeffler KG and INA Bearing Company, Inc. v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–26 (January 29, 1996) with respect to Germany;

SNR Roulements v. *United States*, Slip Op. 98–6 (January 23, 1998) with respect to France;

Federal-Mogul Corporation and the Torrington Company v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–193 (December 12, 1996)

with respect to France, Germany, Japan, Singapore, and Thailand;

Federal-Mogul Corporation and the Torrington Company v. *United States*, Slip Op. 97–9 (January 22, 1997) with respect to Japan.

In the context of the above-cited litigation, the CIT (in some cases based on decisions by the CAFC) ordered the Department to make methodological changes and to recalculate the antidumping margins for certain firms under review. Specifically, the CIT ordered the Department *inter alia* to: (1) Change its methodology for computing inventory carrying costs; (2) reallocate NSK's advertising expenses; (3) deny an adjustment to foreign market value (FMV) for home-market pre-sale freight expenses where FMV was calculated using purchase price; (4) develop a methodology which removes post-sale price adjustments and rebates paid on sales of out-of-scope merchandise from its calculations of FMV or, if no viable method can be developed, deny such an adjustment in its calculation of FMV; (5) reconsider its decision to accept NTN's downward adjustments to United States indirect selling expenses for interest paid on cash deposits; (6) determine whether NTN demonstrated that selling expenses for aftermarket customers were different than for distributors and OEMs and, if not, collapse sales to aftermarket customers and distributors to form a single level of trade; (7) provide a reasonable explanation as to why the Department changed its findings in the original investigation that NMB/Pelmec's ''Route B'' sales are third-country sales or, if none can be given, exclude these sales from the home-market database; (8) determine whether NMB/Pelmec's related-party sales were made at market prices and, if not, exclude such sales from its calculation of profit; and (9) correct various clerical errors.

On December 12, 1996, the CIT affirmed the Department's final remand results affecting final assessment rates for all the above cases (except the reviews involving SKF which are still subject to further litigation). *See Federal-Mogul Corporation and the Torrington Company* v. *United States*, Slip Op. 96–193 (December 12, 1996). As there are now final and conclusive court decisions in these actions, we are amending our final results of review in these matters, with the exception of those cases which are still under appeal, and we will subsequently instruct the Customs Service to liquidate entries subject to these reviews.

Amendment to Final Results

Pursuant to section 516A(e) of the Tariff Act, we are now amending the final results of administrative reviews of the antidumping duty orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom, except for those cases still under appeal, for the period May 1, 1991, through April 30, 1992. The revised weighted-average margins are as follows:

Company	BBs	CRBs	SPBs
FRANCE			
SKF	1.97	(1)	(3)
SNR	1.13	0.81	(2)
GERMANY			
FAG	11.83	17.63	(3)
Fichtel & Sachs	(3)	(2)	(2)
INA	23.19	(3)	(2)
NTN	(3)	(1)	(1)
ITALY			
FAG	5.36	(3)	.....
JAPAN			
Koyo	8.28	3.19	(3)
Nachi	7.59	(3)	(2)
NPB	7.90	(2)	(2)
NTN	2.94	0.73	6.41
NSK	17.85	27.09	(1)
Singapore			
NMB/Pelmec	8.54	.....	.....
THAILAND			
NMB/Pelmec	0.17	.....	.....
UNITED KINGDOM			
Barden Corporation	7.57	(3)	.....
FAG	21.77	(3)	.....
RHP–NSK	50.32	45.61	.....

(1) No U.S. sales during the review period.
(2) No review requested.
(3) No rate change for a class or kind due to litigation.

Accordingly, the Department will determine and the U.S. Customs Service will assess appropriate antidumping duties on entries of the subject merchandise made by firms covered by these reviews. Individual differences between United States price and foreign market value may vary from the percentages listed above. The Department has already issued appraisement instructions to the Customs Service for certain companies whose margins have not changed from those announced in *AFBs III* and the three previous amendments. For companies covered by these amended results, the Department will issue appraisement instructions to the U.S. Customs Service after publication of these amended final results of reviews.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: April 7, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–10040 Filed 4–15–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–403–801]

Fresh and Chilled Atlantic Salmon From Norway; Notice of Rescission of Antidumping New Shipper Review

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

ACTION: Notice of rescission of antidumping new shipper review.

SUMMARY: On December 15, 1997, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the **Federal Register** (62 FR 65666) a notice announcing the initiation of a new shipper antidumping review of the antidumping duty order on fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon from Norway, covering the period April 1, 1996, through September 30, 1997, and one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise, Nornir Group A/S. This review has now been rescinded as a result of the withdrawal of the request for administrative review by the interested party.

EFFECTIVE DATE: April 16, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Todd Peterson or Thomas Futtner, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group II, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–4195 or 482–3814, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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 (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department of Commerce's (the Department's) regulations refer to the regulations codified at 19 CFR part 351, 62 FR 27296 (May 19, 1997).