subheadings are provided for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written description of the scope of this order is dispositive. The term ''mechanical transfer presses'' refers to automatic metal-forming machine tools with multiple die stations in which the work piece is moved from station to station by a transfer mechanism designed as an integral part of the press and synchronized with the press action, whether imported as machines or parts suitable for use solely or principally with these machines. These presses may be imported assembled or unassembled. This review does not cover certain parts and accessories, which were determined to be outside the scope of the order. (*See* ''Final Scope Ruling on Spare and Replacement Parts,'' U.S. Department of Commerce, March 20, 1992; and ''Final Scope Ruling on the Antidumping Duty Order on Mechanical Transfer Presses (MTPs) from Japan: Request by Komatsu, Ltd.,'' U.S. Department of Commerce, October 3, 1996.)

Initiation of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, and Intent To Revoke Order in Part

Section 351.222(g) of the Department's regulations provides that the Department will conduct a changed circumstances administrative review under section 351.216, and may revoke an order (in whole or in part), if it determines that producers accounting for substantially all of the production of the domestic like product to which the order pertains have expressed a lack of interest in the relief provided by the order, in whole or in part, or if other changed circumstances sufficient to warrant revocation exist. *See also* sections 751(b) and 782(h)(2) of the Act. In addition, in the event that the Department concludes that expedited action is warranted, section 351.221(c)(3)(ii) of the regulations permits the Department to combine the notices of initiation and preliminary results.

In the *Memorandum to Joseph A. Spetrini from Barbara E. Tillman, Request for Changed Circumstances Review* (April 13, 2001) (on file in the Central Records Unit of the Department of Commerce, Room B–099), the Department denied a previous request by Sumitomo to initiate a changed circumstances review and partially revoke the order as it pertains to large, hot-forging presses, as defined above, because of a lack of support from petitioners. We believe, however, that the necessary support has been demonstrated in this request and have determined to initiate a changed circumstances review. As stated above, two letters of support from the domestic producers have been placed on the record. We received no objections to the request.

Furthermore, because petitioners have expressed a lack of interest in large, hot-forging presses, we determine that expedited action is warranted and are combining the notice of initiation and preliminary results, in accordance with section 351.221(c)(3)(ii) of our regulations. Therefore, we are hereby notifying the public of our preliminary determination to revoke, in part, the antidumping duty order with respect to large, hot-forging presses from Japan meeting the above description.

If the final revocation, in part, occurs, we intend to instruct the U.S. Customs Service (''Customs'') to liquidate without regard to antidumping duties, as applicable, and to refund any estimated antidumping duties collected for all unliquidated entries of large, hot-forging presses meeting the specifications indicated above, and not subject to final results of administrative review, as of the date of publication in the **Federal Register** of the final results of this changed circumstances review in accordance with section 351.222 of the regulations. We will also instruct Customs to pay interest on such refunds in accordance with section 778 of the Act. The current requirement for a cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties on large, hot-forging presses meeting the above specifications will continue unless and until we publish a final determination to revoke, in part.

Public Comment

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit argument in this proceeding are requested to submit with the argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument. Parties to the proceeding may request a hearing within 14 days of publication of this notice. Any hearing, if requested, will be held no later than two days after the deadline for the submission of rebuttal briefs, or the first workday thereafter. Case briefs may be submitted by interested parties not later than 14 days after the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to the issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than five days after the deadline for submission of case briefs. All written comments shall be submitted in accordance with section 351.303 of the regulations and shall be served on all interested parties on the Department's service list in accordance with section 351.303. Persons interested in attending the hearing should contact the Department for the date and time of the hearing. The Department will publish the final results of this changed circumstances review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any written comments.

This notice is published in accordance with section 751(b)(1) of the Act and sections 351.216 and 351.222 of the regulations.

Dated: June 20, 2001.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 01–17232 Filed 7–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–580–807]

Polyethylene Terephthalate Film From Korea: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review and intent to revoke in part.

SUMMARY: In response to a request from two respondents and two U.S. producers, the Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip (PET film) from the Republic of Korea. The review covers three manufacturers/exporters of the subject merchandise to the United States and the period June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2000.

We preliminarily determine that there are sales at less than normal value for SKC Limited (SKC), and no or *de minimis* sales at less than normal value for H.S. Industries (HSI) and Hyosung Corporation (Hyosung) during the period June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2000. Based on three years of sales at not less than normal value (NV), we intend to revoke the order with respect to HSI if the preliminary results of this review are affirmed in our final results. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the difference between the United States Price (U.S.P.) and normal value (NV).

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit arguments in this proceeding are requested to submit with the arguments: (1) A statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the arguments (no longer than five pages, including footnotes).

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 10, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael J. Heaney or Robert James, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III, Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–4475 and (202) 482–0649, respectively.

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act) are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (2000).

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

The Department published an antidumping duty order on PET film from the Republic of Korea on June 5, 1991. *See Antidumping Duty Order and Amendment to Final Determination of Less Than Fair Value: Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from the Republic of Korea,* 56 FR 25660 (June 5, 1991). On June 30, 2000, two domestic producers, E.I. DuPont Nemours & Co., Inc. and Mitsubishi Polyester Film L.L.C. requested reviews of HSI, Hyosung, and SKC for the period June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2000. On June 30, 1999, SKC and HSI requested administrative reviews of their sales for the same time period. We published a notice of initiation of the review on July 31, 2000. *See Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocation in Part,* 65 FR 46687 (July 31, 2000).

On February 21 2001, the Department published a notice extending the time limits for publication of its preliminary results by 120 days to June 29, 2001. *See Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet, and Strip from Korea: Postponement of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 66 FR 10988 (February 21, 2001).

Verification

As provided for in section 782(i)(2) of the Act, we verified the information submitted by HSI. We used standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturer's facilities and examination of relevant sales and financial records. Our verification findings are outlined in the verification report which is on file in Room B–099 of the main Department of Commerce Building. *See Verification of HSI Sales Questionnaire and Supplemental Questionnaire Responses* dated June 22, 2001.

Intent To Revoke

In its submission of June 30, 2000, HSI requested, pursuant to 19 CFR § 351.222(e)(1), partial revocation of the order with respect to its sales of PET film. HSI certified that (1) it sold the subject merchandise in commercial quantities at not less than NV for a period of at least three consecutive years, (2) in the future it will not sell the subject merchandise at less than NV; and (3) it agreed to its immediate reinstatement of the order if the Department determines that, subsequent to revocation, it sold the subject merchandise at less than NV.

Based upon the preliminary results in this review and the final results of the two proceeding reviews (*see Polyethylene Terephthalate, Film, Sheet and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 65 FR 55003 (September 12, 2000), and *Polyethylene Terephthalate, Film, Sheet, and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty New Shipper Review,* 64 FR 42670 (August 5, 1999)), HSI has preliminarily demonstrated three consecutive years of sales at not less than normal value. Furthermore, we have determined that HSI's aggregate sales to the United States have been made in commercial quantities during these three segments of this proceeding. The company also agreed in writing to immediate reinstatement of the antidumping order, as long as any exporter or producer is subject to the order, if the Department concludes that subsequent to the partial revocation, HSI sold the subject merchandise at less than normal value. Based on the above facts, and absent a determination that the continued application of the antidumping order is otherwise necessary to offset dumping, the Department preliminarily determines that partial revocation with respect to HSI is warranted. Therefore, if these preliminary results are affirmed in our final results, we intend to revoke the order in part with respect to merchandise produced and exported by HSI. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(b), we will terminate the suspension of liquidation for any such merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption after May 31, 2000. The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Act, as amended.

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are shipments of all gauges of raw, pretreated, or primed polyethylene terephthalate film, sheet, and strip, whether extruded or coextruded. The films excluded from this review are metallized films and other finished films that have had at least one of their surfaces modified by the application of a performance-enhancing resinous or inorganic layer of more than 0.00001 inches (0.254 micrometers) thick. Roller transport cleaning film which has at least one of its surfaces modified by the application of 0.5 micrometers of SBR latex has also been ruled as not within the scope of the order.

PET film is currently classifiable under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 3920.62.00.00. The HTS subheading is provided for convenience and for U.S. Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive as to the scope of the product coverage. The review covers the period June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2000.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of PET film in the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared USP to NV, as described in the ''United States Price'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(2) of the Act, we calculated monthly weighted-average prices for NV and compared these to individual U.S. transactions.

United States Price (USP)

In calculating USP, the Department treated HSI's, Hyosung's and SKC's sales as export price (EP) sales, as defined in section 772(a) of the Act, when the merchandise was first sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers prior to the date of importation, and use of the constructed export price (CEP) methodology was not otherwise indicated. The Department treated SKC's sales as CEP sales, as defined in section 772(b) of the Act, when the merchandise was first sold to unaffiliated U.S. purchasers after importation.

EP was based on the delivered or c.i.f. U.S. port, packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for Korean and U.S. brokerage charges, Korean and U.S. inland freight, ocean freight, bank charges, U.S. duties, and discounts, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. We made additions to EP for duty drawback pursuant to section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act.

CEP was based on the delivered, packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made adjustments, where applicable, for Korean and U.S. brokerage charges, Korean and U.S. inland freight, ocean freight, and U.S. duties, in accordance with section 772(c) of the Act. Pursuant to section 772(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we made an addition to CEP for duty drawback. We also made an addition to CEP for interest revenue. In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act, we made deductions for selling expenses associated with economic activities in the United States, including warranties, credit expenses, bank charges, and indirect selling expenses.

With respect to subject merchandise to which value was added in the United States by SKC prior to sale to unaffiliated customers, we deducted the cost of further manufacturing in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act.

Pursuant to section 772(d)(3) of the Act, for SKC the price was further reduced by an amount for profit to arrive at the CEP.

Normal Value

In order to determine whether there were sufficient sales of PET film in the home market (HM) to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV, for each respondent we compared the volume of HM sales of PET film to the volume of PET film sold in the United States, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Each respondent's aggregate volume of HM sales of the foreign like product was greater than five percent of its aggregate volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise. Therefore, we have based NV on the price at which the foreign like product was sold for consumption in the home market in the usual commercial quantities, in the ordinary course of trade and, to the extent practicable, at the same level of trade.

The Department disregarded sales by SKC of the foreign like product in the June 1998—May 1999 administrative review because they failed the cost test (*see Polyethylene Terephthalate Film, Sheet and Strip from the Republic of Korea; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 64 FR 62648 (November 17, 1999) (*1998–1999 Administrative Review*)). Therefore, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act, the Department had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that SKC made sales below cost of production (COP) during this POR. Accordingly, we initiated a sales-below-cost of production investigation for SKC in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act. The June 1998—May 1999 administrative review was the most recently completed review at the time that we issued our antidumping questionnaire.

We performed a model-specific COP test in which we examined whether each HM sale was priced below the merchandise's COP. We calculated the COP of the merchandise using SKC's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market general and administrative (G&A) expenses and packing costs, in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act. We allocated yield losses equally between A-grade and B-grade film because these grades have identical production costs. This is consistent with the methodology employed in past reviews of this case. *See e.g., 1998–1999 Administrative Review,* 64 FR at 62649.

In calculating SKC's G&A expenses, we excluded non-operating income related to SKC's sale of certain production facilities in its Converted Film Division. We excluded this income because it is unrelated to the general operations of the company. We based our calculation of SKC's G&A expenses upon the remaining information reported in Appendix D–14 of SKC's October 27, 2000 questionnaire response.

In accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, in determining whether to disregard home market sales made at prices below COP, we examined whether such sales were made within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether such sales were made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of SKC's sales of a given model were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that model because these below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities. Where 20 percent or more of SKC's home market sales of a given model were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because such sales were found to be made: (1) In substantial quantities within the POR (*i.e.,* within an extended period of time) in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act, and (2) 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 (*i.e.,* the sales were made at prices below the weighted-average per-unit COP for the POR). We used the remaining sales as the basis for determining NV, if such sales existed, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act.

In determining NV, we considered comparison market sales of identical or similar merchandise, or constructed value (CV).

In accordance with section 773(e)(1) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of SKC's cost of materials, fabrication, G&A expenses, and profit. We allocated yield losses equally between A-grade and B-grade film, and recalculated G&A expenses as described above. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based G&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by SKC in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the foreign country. For selling expenses, we used the weighted-average HM selling expenses. Pursuant to section 773(e)(3) of the Act, we included U.S. packing expenses.

In accordance with section 773(a)(6) of the Act, we adjusted NV, where appropriate, by deducting home market packing expenses and adding U.S. packing expenses. We also adjusted NV for credit expenses. When NV was based upon home market sales, we made an adjustment for inland freight. For SKC's local export sales, we also made an addition to home market price for duty drawback. For comparisons to EP, we made an addition to NV for U.S. credit expenses, and bank charges as circumstance-of-sale adjustments pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C) of the Act.

Level of Trade and CEP Offset

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, to the extent practicable, we determine NV based on sales in the comparison market at the same level of trade (LOT) as the EP or CEP transaction. The NV LOT is that of the starting price sales in the comparison market or, when NV is based on CV, that of the sales from which we derive SG&A expenses and profit. For EP, the U.S. LOT is also the level of the starting price sale, which is usually from the exporter to the importer. For CEP, it is the level of the constructed sale from the exporter to the importer.

To determine whether NV sales are at a different LOT than EP or CEP, we examine 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 are at a different LOT, and the difference affects price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which NV is based and comparison market sales at the LOT of the export transaction, we make a LOT adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. Finally, for CEP sales, if the NV level is more remote from the factory than the CEP level and there is no basis for determining whether the differences in the levels between NV and CEP affect price comparability, we adjust NV under section 773(A)(7)(B) of the Act (the CEP offset provision). *See, e.g., Certain Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value,* 62 FR 61731 (November 19, 1997).

In implementing these principles in this review, we asked each respondent to identify the specific differences and similarities in selling functions and/or support services between all phases of marketing in the home market and the United States. SKC identified two channels of distribution in the home market: (1) Wholesalers/distributors and (2) end-users. HSI also identified two channels of distribution: sales to end-users and sales to distributors. Hyosung identified one channel of distribution in the home market: sales to end-users, and we found that Hyosung performed the same type and level of selling functions for all of its sales to end-users. For both channels, SKC and HSI perform similar selling functions such as order processing, market research and after-sales warranty services. Because channels of distribution do not qualify *per se* as separate LOTs, when the selling functions performed for each customer class are sufficiently similar, as in the instant review, we determined that there exists one LOT for SKC's, HSI's, and Hyosung's home market sales.

For the U.S. market, SKC reported two LOTs: (1) EP sales made directly to its U.S. customers, and (2) CEP sales made through SKC America, Inc., SKC's wholly-owned U.S. subsidiary. HSI and Hyosung each identified one LOT: EP sales made directly to U.S. customers. The Department examined the selling functions performed by SKC for both EP and CEP sales. These selling functions included customer sales contacts (*i.e.,* visiting current or potential customers, receiving orders, promotion of new products, collection of unpaid invoices), technical services, inventory maintenance, and/or business system development. The Department also examined the selling functions performed by HSI and Hyosung on their home market and U.S. sales, and determined that Hyosung and HSI both performed substantially the same level of sales contact, inventory maintenance, and/or business system development on both their home market and U.S. sales.

For EP sales, SKC provided its US customers with the selling functions noted above. For CEP sales, SKC performed fewer customer sales contacts, technical services, inventory maintenance, and computer legal, audit and business system development. On CEP sales, these selling fuctions were generally performed by SKC America, Inc. We found that SKC performed significantly greater selling functions on its EP sales, and that the selling functions performed by SKC on its EP and CEP sales were sufficiently different to warrant two separate LOTs in the United States.

When we compared EP sales to home market sales, we determined that for each respondent both sales were made at the same LOT. For both EP and home market transactions, each respondent sold directly to the customer and provided similar levels of customer sales contacts, technical services, inventory maintenance and business system development. Because each respondent performed essentially equivalent services on its EP and home market sales, no LOT adjustment was warranted.

For CEP sales, SKC performed fewer customer sales contacts, technical services, inventory maintenance, and computer legal, audit and business system development then it did in the home market. As previously noted, SKC America, Inc. generally provided these selling functions to SKC's CEP customers. The differences in selling functions performed for home market and CEP transactions indicate that home market sales involved a more advanced stage of distribution than CEP sales since SKC provided a greater degree of services on its home market sales then it did on its CEP sales.

Because we compared these CEP sales to HM sales at a different LOT, we examined whether a LOT adjustment may be appropriate. In this case SKC sold at one LOT in the home market; therefore, there is no demonstrated pattern of consistent price differences between LOTs. Further, we do not have the information which would allow us to examine pricing patterns of SKC's sales of other similar products, and there is no other record evidence on which such an analysis could be based.

Because the data available do not provide an appropriate basis for making a LOT adjustment but the LOT in Korea for SKC is at a more advanced stage than the LOT of its CEP sales, a CEP offset is appropriate in accordance with section 773(a)(7)(B) of the Act, as claimed by SKC. We based the CEP offset amount on the amount of home market indirect selling expenses, and limited the deduction for home market indirect selling expenses to the amount of indirect selling expenses deducted from CEP in accordance with section 772(d)(1)(D) of the Act. We applied the CEP offset to NV, whether based on home market prices or CV.

Preliminary Results of Review

We preliminarily determine that the following margins exist for the period June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2000:

Company	Margin (percent)
HSI	0
Hyosung	0
SKC	5.13

We will disclose calculations performed in connection with these preliminary results of review within 5 days of the day of publication of this notice. Interested parties may request a hearing not later than 30 days after publication of this notice. Interested parties may also submit written arguments in case briefs on these preliminary results within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Rebuttal briefs, limited to issues raised in case briefs, may be filed no later than five days after the time limit for filing case briefs. Parties who submit arguments are requested to submit with each argument a statement of the issue and a brief summary of the argument. All memoranda to which we refer in this notice can be found in the public reading room, located in the Central Records Unit, room B–099 of the main Commerce building. Any hearing, if requested, will be held two days after the scheduled date for submission of rebuttal briefs.

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including a discussion of its analysis of issues raised in any case or rebuttal brief or at a hearing. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Upon completion of the final results in this review, the Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all

appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b), we have calculated an importer/customer-specific assessment rate based on the ratio of the total amount of antidumping duties calculated for the examined sales to the entered value of those same sales. The Department will issue appraisement instructions on each exporter directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of this administrative review for all shipments of PET film from the Republic of Korea entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for the reviewed firm will be the rate established in the final results of administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in this review but covered in the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation or a previous review, the cash deposit will continue to be the most recent rate published in the final determination or final results for which the manufacturer or exporter received a company-specific rate; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review or the original investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be that established for the manufacturer of the merchandise in the final results of this review or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 21.5%, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation.

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 Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: June 29, 2001.

Richard W. Moreland,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration

[FR Doc. 01–17231 Filed 7–9–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–570–601]

Tapered Roller Bearings and Parts Thereof, Finished and Unfinished, From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Results of 1999–2000 Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Review, and Notice of Intent Not To Revoke Order in Part

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of 1999–2000 administrative review, partial rescission of the review, and notice of intent not to revoke order in part.

SUMMARY: We preliminarily determine that sales of tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished, from the People's Republic of China, were made below normal value during the period June 1, 1999 through May 31, 2000. We are also rescinding the review, in part, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d)(3).

Weihai Machinery Holding (Group) Co., China National Machinery Import & Export Corporation, Wanxiang Group Corporation, and Zhejiang Machinery Import & Export Corp. have requested revocation of the antidumping duty order in part. Based on record evidence, we preliminarily find that none of these companies qualifies for revocation. Accordingly, we preliminarily determine not to revoke the order with respect to the subject merchandise produced and exported by these four companies.

If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties based on the differences between the export price or constructed export price and normal value on all appropriate entries. Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

EFFECTIVE DATE: July 10, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Jarrod Goldfeder, Melani Miller, or Anthony Grasso, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–0189, (202) 482–0116, or (202) 482–3853, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Applicable Statute

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all references to the Department of Commerce's (''the Department'') regulations are to 19 CFR Part 351 (April 2000).

Background

On May 27, 1987, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (52 FR 19748) the antidumping duty order on tapered roller bearings and parts thereof, finished and unfinished (''TRBs''), from the People's Republic of China (''PRC''). The Department notified interested parties of the opportunity to request an administrative review of this order on June 20, 2000 (65 FR 38242). On June 26, 2000, Wanxiang Group Corporation (''Wanxiang''), China National Machinery Import & Export Corporation (''CMC''), Liaoning MEC Group Co. Ltd. (''Liaoning''), Premier Bearing & Equipment Ltd. (''Premier''), Tianshui Hailin Import and Export Corporation and Hailin Bearing Factory (''Hailin''), and Weihai Machinery Holding (Group) Co., Ltd. (''Weihai'') requested administrative reviews. On June 30, 2000, Wafangdian Bearing Group Corp. Import & Export Company (''Wafangdian''), Luoyang Bearing Corporation (Group) (''Luoyang''), Zhejiang Machinery Import & Export Corp. (''ZMC''), and Zhejiang Changshan Changhe Bearing Corp. (''ZCCBC'') also requested administrative reviews. Weihai, Wafangdian, ZMC, Wanxiang, and CMC also requested that the Department revoke the antidumping duty order as it pertains to them. On June 30, 2000, the petitioner, The Timken Company, requested that the Department conduct an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on hundreds of PRC TRB exporters. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.221(b)(1), we published a notice of initiation of this antidumping duty administrative review on July 31, 2000 (65 FR 46687). We published a revision to this initiation notice on August 10, 2000 (65 FR 48968).

On August 16, 2000, we sent a questionnaire to the Secretary General of the Basic Machinery Division of the Chamber of Commerce for Import & Export of Machinery and Electronics Products and requested that the questionnaire be forwarded to all PRC companies identified in our initiation notice and to any subsidiary companies of the named companies that produce and/or export the subject merchandise. In this letter, we also requested