

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.

This administrative review and notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 355.22.

Dated September 29, 1995.

Susan G. Esserman,
Assistant Secretary for Import
Administration.

Appendix A

Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review, ball bearings, mounted or unmounted, and parts thereof, are described below.

Ball Bearings, Mounted or Unmounted, and Parts Thereof

These products include all antifriction bearings which employ balls as the rolling element. During the review period, imports of these products were classifiable under the following categories: antifriction balls; ball bearings with integral shafts; ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof; ball bearing type pillow blocks and parts thereof; ball bearing type flange, take-up, cartridge, and hanger units, and parts thereof; and other bearings (except tapered roller bearings) and parts thereof. Wheel hub units which employ balls as the rolling element are subject to the review. Finished but unground or semiground balls are not included in the scope of this review. Imports of these products are currently classifiable under the following HTS item numbers: 8482.10.10, 8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.10, 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, 8708.99.50.

This review covers 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. 95-24929 Filed 10-5-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[C-549-802]

Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Thailand; Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of Final Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review.

SUMMARY: On August 16, 1995, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published in the Federal Register its preliminary results of administrative review of the countervailing duty order on *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Thailand* for the period January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993. We have completed this review and determine the net subsidy to be 4.85 percent *ad valorem* for all companies. We will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess countervailing duties as indicated above.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 6, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Copyak or Kelly Parkhill, 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 August 16, 1995, the Department published in the Federal Register (60 FR 42532) the preliminary results of its administrative review of the countervailing duty order on *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Thailand*. The Department has now completed this administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

We invited interested parties to comment on the preliminary results. On September 15, 1995, a case brief was submitted by Pelmec Thai Ltd., NMB Thai Ltd., and NMB Hi-Tech Ltd. (three related companies, hereinafter the Minebea Group), producers/exporters of the subject merchandise during the review period (respondents). On September 15, 1995, a case brief was submitted by the Torrington Company (petitioner). On September 22, 1995, a rebuttal brief was submitted by respondents. The review covers the period January 1, 1993 through December 31, 1993. The review involves the Minebea Group of companies, which accounts for virtually all exports of

subject merchandise from Thailand, and nine programs.

Applicable Statute and Regulations

The Department is conducting this administrative review in accordance with section 751(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are in reference to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994. However, references to the Department's *Countervailing Duties; Notice of Proposed Rulemaking and Request for Public Comments*, 54 FR 23366 (May 31, 1989) (*Proposed Regulations*), are provided solely for further explanation of the Department's countervailing duty practice. Although the Department has withdrawn the particular rulemaking proceeding pursuant to which the *Proposed Regulations* were issued, the subject matter of these regulations is being considered in connection with an ongoing rulemaking proceeding which, among other things, is intended to conform the Department's regulations to the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. See 60 FR 80 (Jan. 3, 1995).

Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review are ball bearings and parts thereof. Such merchandise 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. The written description remains dispositive.

Calculation Methodology for Assessment and Cash Deposit Purposes

In the first administrative review, respondents claimed that the F.O.B. value of the subject merchandise entering the United States is greater than the F.O.B. price charged by the companies in Thailand (57 FR 26646; June 15, 1992). They explained that this discrepancy is due to a mark-up charged by the parent company, located in a third country, through which the merchandise is invoiced. However, the subject merchandise is shipped directly from Thailand to the United States and is not transshipped, combined with other merchandise, or repackaged with other merchandise. In other words, for each shipment of subject merchandise, there are two invoices and two corresponding F.O.B. export prices: (1) the F.O.B. export price at which the subject merchandise leaves Thailand, and on which subsidies from the Royal Thai Government (RTG) are earned by the companies, and upon which the