Reserve Bank. However, the Federal Reserve Bank does not track or publish exchange rates for Brazilian currency. Therefore, we made currency conversions based on the daily exchange rates from the Dow Jones Business Information Service, as published in the Wall Street Journal.

Section 773A(a) directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars, ignoring any ''fluctuations.'' We determine that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from a benchmark rate by 2.25 percent or more. The benchmark rate is defined as the rolling average of the rates for the past 40 business days. When we determined that a fluctuation existed, we substituted the benchmark rate for the daily rate. For a complete discussion of the Department's exchange rate methodology, *See*, ''Change in Policy Regarding Currency Conversions'' (61 FR 9434, March 8, 1996).

Preliminary Results

As a result of this review, we preliminarily determine that the following weighted-average dumping margin exists for the period August 16, 1993 through February 28, 1995:

| Manufacturer/producer/exporter | Margin (percent) |
|---|---|
| Companhia de Ferro Ligas da Bahia | 0.00 |

Parties to this proceeding may request disclosure within five days of the publication of this notice and any interested party may request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication, or the first working day thereafter. Interested parties may submit case briefs and/or written comments no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in such briefs or comments, may be filed no later than 37 days after the date of publication. The Department will publish a notice of the final results of the administrative review, which will include the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at the hearing, within 180 days from the issuance of these preliminary results.

The Department shall determine, and Customs shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between USP and NV may vary from the percentages stated above. The Department will issue appraisement instructions directly to Customs. The final results of this review shall be the basis for the assessment of antidumping dumping duties on entries of merchandise covered by the determination and for future deposits of estimated duties.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon completion of the final results of these administrative reviews for all shipments of ferrosilicon from Brazil entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of these administrative reviews, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) the cash deposit rate for Ferbasa will be the rate established in the final results of administrative review; (2) for merchandise exported by manufacturers or exporters not covered in these reviews but covered in the original 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 these reviews, 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 these reviews, or the LTFV investigation; and (4) if neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in these or any previous reviews, the cash deposit rate will be 35.95 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the antidumping duty order (59 FR 11769, March 14, 1994).

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26(b) 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 section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)).

Dated: April 29, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 96–11491 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M**

**[A–821–803]**

## Titanium Sponge From the Russian Federation; Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Time Limits

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

**ACTION:** Notice of extension of time limits.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit of the preliminary results of the third administrative review of the antidumping duty order on titanium sponge from the Russian Federation. The review covers one manufacturer/exporter and two resellers of the subject merchandise, covering the period August 1, 1994 through July 31, 1995.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 8, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Amy S. Wei or Zev Primor, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230, telephone: (202) 482–5253.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Because it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by Section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until September 3, 1996. See Memo to Susan G. Esserman from Joseph A. Spetrini regarding Extension of Time Limit for the Preliminary Results of Administrative Review, April 25, 1996. We will issue our final results for this review by January 2, 1997.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)).

Dated: May 1, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.*

[FR Doc. 96–11390 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P**

**[C–559–802]**

## Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From Singapore; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Reviews and Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders.

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of changed circumstances countervailing duty reviews and revocation of countervailing duty orders.

**SUMMARY:** On April 27, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its changed circumstances reviews and intent to revoke the countervailing duty (CVD) orders on antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof (AFBs) from Singapore. We have now completed these reviews and have determined to revoke the CVD orders. The revocation applies to all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1995. Therefore, we will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of the subject merchandise from Singapore entered on or after January 1, 1995.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 8, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Albright or Cameron Cardozo, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

### Background

On February 3, 1995, the Torrington Company (Torrington), the petitioner in the original CVD investigations (54 FR 19125), submitted a letter to the Department stating that it has no further interest in the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore for entries after December 31, 1994. Accordingly, Torrington requested revocation of the orders based on changed circumstances in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 355.25(d)(1994).

On April 27, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 20671) the preliminary results of its changed circumstances reviews and intent to revoke the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore. (*See* 19 C.F.R. 355.22(h)(4)). These changed circumstances reviews cover all producers and/or exporters of the subject merchandise and all shipments of this merchandise to the United States entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1995.

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results and intent to revoke the orders. On May 30, 1995, NTN-Bower, Inc. and American NTN Bearing Manufacturing Corp. (NTN), NSK Corp. (NSK), and SKF USA, Inc. (SKF) submitted written objections to our intended revocations. On June 6, 1995, the Minebea Companies, exporters of the subject merchandise from Singapore, and Torrington submitted rebuttal comments.

On June 30, 1995, FAG Bearings Corp./Barden Corp. (FAG & Barden) and NSK filed requests for an injury investigation with the International Trade Commission (ITC) pursuant to section 753(a) of the Act for all five classes of bearings covered by the countervailing duty orders on AFBs from Singapore. American Koyo Bearing Manufacturing Corp. (Koyo) filed an injury request with the ITC under section 753(a) with respect to ball bearings from Singapore. Koyo, FAG & Barden, and NSK also filed requests for simultaneous expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews of the antidumping duty orders on AFBs and tapered roller bearings (TRBs) covering several countries (including, but not limited to, Singapore) pursuant to section 753(e). NTN and SKF filed their requests for expedited sunset reviews of all these orders in conjunction with their section 753(a) requests for an injury investigation regarding the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand. 54 FR 19130 (May 3, 1989).

On October 26, 1995, the Department held a public hearing on the preliminary results of these reviews and the concurrent changed circumstances review of the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand. (*See* Transcript of Hearing on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce (*Hearing Transcript*)).

The Department has now completed these changed circumstances reviews in accordance with section 751(b) and 782(h) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

### Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute are references to the provisions of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (URAA) effective January 1, 1995. The Department is conducting these changed circumstances reviews in accordance with section 751(b) and has determined to revoke the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore based on sections 751(d) and 782(h) of the Act. *See also* 19 C.F.R. § 355.25(d)(1)(i).

### Scope of the Reviews

Imports covered by these reviews are antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof. The subject merchandise covers five separate classes or kinds of merchandise and is described in detail in Appendix A to this notice. The *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item numbers listed in Appendix A are provided for convenience and Customs purposes only. The written description remains dispositive.

### Analysis of Comments

*Comment 1:* SKF, NTN, and NSK (collectively the ''Objecting Parties''), argue that the statute and the Department's regulations define a domestic interested party to include ''a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States of a domestic like product.'' 19 U.S.C. § 1677(9)(C). The Department's regulations permit revocation of a countervailing duty order based upon lack of industry support only where domestic interested parties demonstrate no further interest in the order. Since SKF, NTN, and NSK maintain that they are domestic producers of a like product and oppose revocation, they state that the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore may not be revoked.

The Government of Singapore and four exporters of AFBs from Singapore (NMB Singapore Ltd., Pelmec Industries Ltd., Minebea Trading, and Minebea Company Ltd.) (collectively the ''Exporters''), counter that the Department should revoke the CVD orders despite the objections raised by the Objecting Parties. The Exporters believe that the Department should decide this issue based on the standards used to determine whether standing exists to initiate a CVD investigation. They claim that this standard is supported by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit's (CAFC's) ruling in *Oregon Steel Mills, Inc.* v. *United States*, 862 F.2d 1541 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In that case, according to the Exporters, the CAFC affirmed the Department's determination to revoke an antidumping duty (AD) order, despite objections from a domestic interested party, on the grounds that ''just as industry support underlies the merits of an order, lack of industry support provides a ground for

revocation.'' They believe that the Objecting Parties would not have standing to object to the initiation of a CVD investigation. According to the Exporters, the Department may initiate an investigation only if the petition is supported, *inter alia*, by ''more than 50 percent of the production of the domestic like product produced by that portion of the industry expressing support for or opposition to the petition.'' 19 U.S.C. § 1673a(c)(4)(A). Thus, if companies representing more than 50 percent of the domestic production support revocation of the order, Commerce should revoke the order. Of the four domestic companies that have expressed an opinion in this proceeding, the Exporters believe that Torrington accounts for more than 50 percent of production and, therefore, the order should be revoked.

*Department's Position:* We disagree with the Objecting Parties. Under 19 C.F.R. § 355.25(d)(1)(i) the Department may revoke a CVD order if the Secretary concludes that the order is no longer of interest to interested parties or that other changed circumstances exist which are sufficient to warrant revocation. Included in the definition of ''interested party'' under section 355.2(i)(3) is ''[a] producer in the United States of the like product.'' Since the objecting companies meet the definition of an ''interested party,'' we must address the question of whether the Department may revoke the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore despite the objections of these companies.

The preamble to section 355.25(d) of the Department's regulations states that the opposition of one or more domestic parties to revocation should be evaluated in the context of the continuing requirement that the order have the support of the industry. 53 FR 52333, December 27, 1988. In *Oregon Steel Mills* the CAFC compared the level of industry support needed to justify revocation to the level of industry support needed to justify an investigation. 862 F.2d at 1545. In determining whether a particular party has standing to object to the filing of a petition, it is settled law that the agency may exclude producers who are related to foreign producers or U.S. importers of the subject merchandise. 19 U.S.C. §§ 1673a(c)(4)(B) & 1677(4)(B). The preamble to section 355.2(h) of the Department's regulations, regarding the proper definition of ''industry,'' states that the reason for excluding related parties from the industry for standing purposes is to limit standing to those domestic firms that have a ''stake in the outcome.'' 53 FR 52307. While section 355.25(d) does not contain similar language, the logic of the preamble applies equally to a no-interest revocation situation. Thus, if the objections of the parties to the revocations derive not from their interest as domestic producers, but from their relationship to producers of AFBs in other countries, then they are not considered domestic producers for purposes of the no-interest revocation issue. Applying the reasoning of another industry-support case, whether the objections should be recorded depends upon whether the objecting parties have a common ''stake'' with the petitioner in the continuation of the orders. *Citrosuco Paulista, S.A.* v. *United States*, 704 F. Supp. 1075, 1085 (CIT 1988).

For the following reasons, the Department has ample reason to question the alignment of the objectors' interests with the interests of the petitioner and, thus, whether the objectors have a common ''stake'' with the petitioner in the maintenance of the orders. First, the CVD investigations of AFBs from Singapore were conducted simultaneously with AD investigations concerning AFBs from France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Romania, Singapore, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom. Over the course of the original investigations of all nine countries, the companies currently objecting to revocation were actively opposed to the imposition of duties sought by the petitioner. They also urged the ITC to determine that Torrington and other members of the domestic industry were neither materially injured nor threatened with material injury by reason of the subject imports.

Moreover, once the CVD orders were imposed on AFBs from Singapore, the Objecting Parties did not participate in any of the subsequent administrative reviews. None of the Objecting Parties demonstrated any interest in the CVD orders after their imposition until the Department published its intent to revoke these orders. Also, at the October 26, 1995 public hearing, parties stated that the purpose behind their opposition to the revocation of the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore is the access it provides them to expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews under section 753(e) of the Act of the AD orders on AFBs and TRBs from twelve countries including the ones where their related companies (including parent companies) are located. (*See Hearing Transcript*, at 40, 95). Upon gaining access to this mechanism for expediting these sunset reviews, the Objecting Parties intend to argue that there is no injury to the U.S. industry if these AD and CVD orders on AFBs and TRBs are revoked. (*See Hearing Transcript*, at 52–3, 94).

In these changed circumstances reviews, Torrington has admitted that its request for revoking the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore is designed to prevent the sunset reviews on the AD orders covering AFBs and TRBs from being expedited. *Hearing Transcript*, at 32. In this sense, Torrington is acting consistently in the role of ''petitioner''—that is, it is willing to sacrifice the limited relief afforded by the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore in order to safeguard, at least for the time being, the broader relief afforded the domestic industry by the AD orders on AFBs and TRBs from Singapore as well as from the other countries. Conversely, the Objecting Parties have made it clear that their interest in these orders is neither aligned with that of the petitioner nor made in their capacity as domestic producers. Thus, the Objecting Parties cannot be said to have a common ''stake'' with the petitioner in the continuation of the orders. As such, we do not consider the Objecting Parties to be domestic producers for purposes of section 782(h)(2) of the Act or 19 C.F.R. § 355.25(d)(1)(i).

As a result, the Department finds the objections to revocation without merit. Accordingly, we find that Torrington's expression of no interest in the continuation of the orders meets the criteria for revocation presented in section 782(h)(2) (19 U.S.C. § 1677m(h)) and 19 C.F.R. § 355.25(d)(1)(i). (For a further explanation of the Department's analysis, *see* April 15, 1996 memorandum to Susan G. Esserman regarding AFBs from Singapore and Thailand, which is on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce.)

*Comment 2:* Torrington points out that of the ninety-five U.S. producers of AFBs, only three have expressed opposition to revocation of the CVD orders with respect to Singapore. Torrington argues that against this indication of a lack of interest in the orders by the overwhelming majority of the industry, the opposition of three companies is insignificant. Torrington also states that the Department's regulations support this interpretation because ''[t]he opposition of one or more domestic parties, including the petitioner, would be evaluated within the context of the continuing requirement that the order have the support of the industry.'' 53 FR 52306, 52332 (1988).

Torrington continues that the genesis of the regulation is found in the proceedings involving *Carbon Steel Plate from Korea*, 51 FR 13039 (1986).

There, the Department revoked (and was upheld by the CAFC) the AD order notwithstanding the opposition of a single producer out of seven U.S. producers. *See Oregon Steel Mills Inc.* v. *United States*, 862 F.2d 1541 (Fed Cir. 1988). As applied here, argues Torrington, the regulation provides for revocation of the order since, not one of seven, but three out of ninety-five companies have expressed opposition to revocation of the orders. In the circumstances of the case, the industry as a whole supports the revocation of the order.

*Department's Position:* The number of objecting parties in relation to the universe of domestic producers which comprise the domestic AFBs industry is not the relevant question in this proceeding. As discussed in our response to Comment 1, the relevant issue is whether those producers (whose interests are aligned with the petitioner and, thus, who have a ''stake'' in the relief provided by the order) accounting for substantially all of the production of the domestic like product want the order revoked. As a result of our analysis, we have determined that the Objecting Parties (i) opposed the original petition, (ii) did not participate in any administrative reviews of the CVD orders on Singapore, and (iii) now seek to retain the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore only as a vehicle to obtain expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews at which time they will argue for revocation of most, if not all, of the AD and CVD orders on AFBs and TRBs from twelve countries, including ones where their related (e.g., parent) companies are located. Thus, we conclude that the Objecting Parties cannot be said to have a common ''stake'' with the petitioner in the relief provided by the orders.

*Comment 3:* Torrington contends that the URAA provides that the Department may disregard the objections of domestic producers that are importers of the subject merchandise or that are related to foreign producers subject to an order. Given SKF's affiliate in Singapore, SKF is potentially an importer of the subject merchandise. Although ''support'' for an AD order would not be disregarded under § 1673a(c)(4)(B)(i), Torrington argues that Commerce ''may'' disregard SKF's position to the extent that it is potentially an importer of subject merchandise from Singapore under § 1673a(c)(4)(B)(ii).

*Department's Position:* At a July 26, 1995 meeting with Department officials, SKF stated that it is related to a producer of AFBs in Singapore. Under long-standing administrative practice, which has been codified in the U.S. antidumping statute for many years at section 771(4)(B) of the Act, the Department has the discretion to exclude a domestic producer of a like product from the industry if that producer is related to a foreign producer or exporter of the subject merchandise. However, in this case, as we explain in response to Comment 1, we are rejecting SKF's opposition to revocation of the instant orders because it does not derive from SKF's interests as a domestic producer. Rather, it reflects SKF's interests as a foreign producer and/or exporter who seeks, in the context of expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews under section 753(e) of the Act, the revocation of AD and CVD orders covering related foreign companies. Thus, under these circumstances, it is appropriate for the Department to exclude SKF from the industry and to disregard its opposition to revocation of the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore.

*Comment 4:* Torrington argues that the Department's independent authority to revoke the order on the basis of ''other changed circumstances'' (i.e., 19 C.F.R. § 355.25(d)(1)(ii)) is appropriately invoked where, as here, the three companies now opposing revocation were opposed to any AD or CVD orders from the outset and are themselves subsidiaries of foreign producers subject to concurrent AD orders. According to Torrington, the existence of multiple AD and CVD orders covering several countries and the peculiar circumstances in which SKF, NTN and NSK have opposed revocation of the CVD orders on Singapore call into question whether the opposition to revocation is *bona fide.*

*Department's Position:* We are revoking the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore because they are no longer of interest to the domestic industry. Accordingly, we do not need to address whether ''other changed circumstances'' exist which would justify revocation.

## Final Results of Changed Circumstances Reviews and Revocation of Countervailing Duty Orders

The Department has determined to revoke the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore. Although we received objections to our preliminary determination to revoke the orders, the Objecting Parties have made it clear that their interest in the orders is neither aligned with that of petitioner nor made in their capacity as domestic producers. Rather, the Objecting Parties seek to retain these CVD orders only as a vehicle to argue for revocation of all outstanding CVD and AD orders on AFBs and TRBs through expedited sunset reviews (*see* § 753(e) of the Act). Since the Objecting Parties are not considered domestic producers for purposes of this no-interest revocation, Torrington's expression of no interest in the continuation of the orders meets the criteria for revocation presented in section 782(h)(2) of the Act and section 355.25(d)(1)(i) of the Department's regulations. (For a further explanation of the Department's analysis, see the Memorandum for Susan G. Esserman regarding AFBs from Singapore and Thailand, dated April 15, 1996, which is on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce). This revocation applies to all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1995.

The Department will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to terminate the suspension of liquidation as of the date of publication of this notice and to liquidate all entries of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1995, without regard to countervailing duties. We will also instruct the U.S. Customs Service to refund with interest any estimated countervailing duties collected with respect to those entries.

This notice serves as a 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 C.F.R. 355.34(d). Timely written 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.

These changed circumstances reviews and notice are in accordance with sections 751(b), 751(d) (1) and (3), and 782(h) of the Act (19 U.S.C. §§ 1675(b), 1675(d) (1) & (3), and 1675m(h) (1995)) and 19 C.F.R. §§ 355.22(h) and 355.25(d)(1994).

Dated: April 29, 1996.

Susan G. Esserman,

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

## Appendix A

### Scope of the Reviews

The products covered by these reviews, antifriction bearings (other than tapered roller bearings), mounted or unmounted, and parts thereof, constitute the following separate ''classes or kinds'' of merchandise as outlined below.

(1) Ball Bearings, Mounted or Unmounted, and Parts Thereof: These products include all antifriction bearings which employ balls as the rolling element. Such merchandise is classifiable under the following *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (HTS) item numbers: 8482.10.10, 8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.10, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.70, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.40, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.99.52, 8708.99.55, 8708.99.58, 8708.99.61, 8708.99.64, 8708.99.67, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.80.

(2) Spherical Roller Bearings, Mounted or Unmounted, and Parts Thereof: These products include all antifriction bearings which employ spherical rollers as the rolling element. Such merchandise is classifiable under the following HTS item numbers: 8482.30.00, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.50, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.70, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.40, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.99.52, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8055, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8058, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8061, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8064, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8067, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.80.

(3) Cylindrical Roller Bearings, Mounted or Unmounted, and Parts Thereof: These products include all antifriction bearings which employ cylindrical rollers as the rolling element. Such merchandise is classifiable under the following HTS item numbers: 8482.50.00, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.70, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.40, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.99.52, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8055, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8058, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8061, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8064, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8067, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.80.

(4) Needle Roller Bearings, Mounted or Unmounted, and Parts Thereof: These products include all antifriction bearings which employ needle rollers as the rolling element. Such merchandise is classifiable under the following HTS item numbers: 8482.40.00, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.70, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.30.40, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.99.52, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8055, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8058, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8061, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8064, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8067, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.80.

(5) Spherical Plain Bearings, Mounted or Unmounted, and Parts Thereof: These products include all spherical plain bearings which do not employ rolling elements and include spherical plain rod ends. Such merchandise is classifiable under the following HTS item numbers: 8483.30.40, 8483.30.80, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8485.90.00, 8708.99.52, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8055, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8058, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8061, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8064, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.8067, 8708.99.70, 8708.99.73, and 8708.99.80.

These reviews cover all of the subject bearings and parts thereof outlined above with certain limitations. With regard to finished parts (inner race, outer race, cage, rollers, balls, seals, shields, etc.), all such parts are included in the scope of this review. For unfinished parts (inner race, outer race, rollers, balls, etc.), such parts are included if (1) they have been heat treated, or (2) heat treatment is not required to be performed on the part. Thus, the only unfinished parts that are not covered by this review are those where the part will be subject to heat treatment after importation.

FR Doc. 11389 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

**[C–549–802]**

## Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Thailand; Final Results of Changed Circumstances Countervailing Duty Review and Revocation of Countervailing Duty Order

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

**ACTION:** Notice of final results of changed circumstances countervailing duty review and revocation of countervailing duty order.

**SUMMARY:** On June 1, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the preliminary results of its changed circumstances review and intent to revoke the countervailing duty (CVD) order on ball bearings from Thailand. We have now completed this review and have determined to revoke the CVD order. The revocation applies to all shipments of subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1995. Therefore, we will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of the subject merchandise from Thailand entered on or after January 1, 1995.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** May 8, 1996.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Brian Albright or Cameron Cardozo, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

Background

On February 3, 1995, the Torrington Company (Torrington), the petitioner in the original countervailing duty investigation (54 FR 19130), submitted a letter to the Department stating that it has no further interest in the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand for entries after December 31, 1994. Accordingly, Torrington requested revocation of the order based on changed circumstances in accordance with 19 C.F.R. § 355.25(d) (1994).

On June 1, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 28576) the initiation and preliminary results of its changed circumstances review and intent to revoke the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand. (See 19 C.F.R. § 355.22(h)(4)). This changed circumstances review covers all producers and/or exporters of the subject merchandise and all shipments of this merchandise to the United States entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after January 1, 1995.

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results and intent to revoke the order. The following parties submitted written objections to our intended revocation: American NTN Bearing Manufacturing Corp. and NTN-Bower (NTN) (June 15, 1995); SKF USA, Inc. (SKF) (June 26, 1995); NSK Corp. (NSK) (June 28, 1995); Barden Corp./FAG Bearings Corp. (FAG & Barden) (June 30, 1995); and Koyo Bearing Manufacturing Corp. (Koyo) (June 30, 1995) (collectively the ''Objecting Parties''). On July 3, 1995, Torrington submitted a case brief. On July 10, 1995, both Torrington and each of the Objecting Parties submitted rebuttal briefs.

On June 30, 1995, all five of the above-mentioned Objecting Parties filed requests for an injury investigation with the International Trade Commission (ITC) pursuant to section 753(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the ''Act''), with respect to ball bearings from Thailand. These parties also filed requests for simultaneous expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews of the antidumping duty (AD) orders on antifriction bearings (AFBs) and tapered roller bearings (TRBs) covering several countries (including, but not limited to, Thailand) pursuant to section 753(e) of the Act.

On October 26, 1995, the Department held a public hearing on the preliminary results of this review and the concurrent changed circumstances reviews of the CVD orders on AFBs from Singapore. (*See* Transcript of Hearing on file in the public file of the Central Records Unit,