

company substantially cooperated with our requests for information, but failed to provide all information requested in a timely manner or in the form requested, we used as BIA the higher of (1) the highest rate (including the "all others" rate) ever applicable to the firm for the same class or kind of merchandise from the same country from either the LTFV investigation or a prior administrative review; or (2) the highest calculated rate in this review for any firm for the class or kind of merchandise from the same country (see Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation in Part of an Antidumping Duty Order, 58 FR 39728 (July 26, 1993), and *Empresa Nacional Siderurgica v. United States*, Slip Op. 95-33 (CIT March 6, 1995)).

Cross-Trade GmbH, INA France, Naniwa Kogyo, Nichimen, Nissho Iwai, Origin Electric, Sanken Trading, SNFA, Taikoyo Sangyo, THK Co., TOK Bearing Co., and Tomen failed to respond to the Department's questionnaire. Therefore, we have applied first-tier BIA, which is the highest rate ever found for each relevant class or kind of merchandise and country of origin.

Furthermore, Asahi Seiko provided only invoices with respect to SPBs and Nippon Thompson failed to provide information on its sales of CRBs. Therefore, both firms received the highest rate ever found for these classes or kinds of merchandise from Japan.

Minamiguchi provided a response to Section A of the Department's questionnaire. However, the company was notified through a deficiency letter that the questionnaire response was improperly filed. In response, Minamiguchi requested Japanese translations of all documents that the Department served it. That request was rejected and the company did not make any further attempts to respond to the Department's deficiency letter, nor did the company respond to any other sections of the Department's questionnaire. Therefore, we determined them to be uncooperative and have applied first-tier BIA, which is the highest rate ever found for each relevant class or kind of merchandise from Japan (for more information on the use of BIA for Japanese companies, see the November 29, 1995, Decision memo).

Finally, NPBS and INA Germany cooperated fully with our requests for information and agreed to undergo verification. However, at verification, we discovered that both firms had failed to report relevant sales and expense data or could not adequately substantiate important information.

With respect to NPBS, the Department was not satisfied with the completeness of the home market database. Specifically, NPBS failed to report certain sales in its home market sales database, including sales to its largest customer for a 12-month period. Also, NPBS failed to properly report quantity adjustments for selected sales. Moreover, the Department was not satisfied with the completeness of the U.S. database. Specifically, NPBS failed to explain why it did not include certain sales in its U.S. sales database. There were additional discrepancies regarding adjustments to sales price. Specifically, NPBS failed to include all loans in its calculation of short-term interest rate in the home market. Finally, NPBS failed to report several categories of freight expenses related to sales in the United States (Verification reports on NPBS, March 22, 1995, and March 24, 1995).

With respect to INA, the Department was not satisfied that INA had reported completely and accurately all of its U.S. sales. At verification, INA was not able to reconcile its financial statements to the response, nor was INA able to support the accuracy of sales of subject merchandise reported during the POR (Verification Report on INA Bearing Company, June 15, 1995). Furthermore, INA could not explain why a sale of subject merchandise was not reported in its response. While the Department was not able to verify that INA reported all of its sales of subject merchandise, INA did cooperate with the Department's requests for information and agreed to undergo verification. As a result, the Department is assigning a second-tier BIA rate to INA (Use of Best Information Available memo, May 22, 1995).

Since both firms attempted to cooperate, we have applied second-tier BIA, which is their highest previous rates, in this case the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation for NPBS (BBs) and INA Germany (CRBs). For BBs for INA Germany, the highest rate ever calculated was for the second review (see Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al.; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, 57 FR 28360 (June 24, 1992)).

Intent To Revoke

NMB/Pelmec submitted a request, in accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.25(b), to revoke the order covering ball bearings from Thailand with respect to NMB/Pelmec's sales of this merchandise.

In accordance with 19 C.F.R. 353.25(a)(2)(iii), this request was accompanied by certifications from the firm that it had not sold the relevant

class or kind of merchandise at less than FMV for a three-year period including this review period, and would not do so in the future. NMB/Pelmec also agreed to its immediate reinstatement in the relevant antidumping order, as long as any firm is subject to this order, if the Department concludes under 19 C.F.R. 353.22(f) that, subsequent to revocation, it sold the subject merchandise at less than FMV.

In the two prior reviews of this order, we determined that NMB/Pelmec did not sell BBs from Thailand at less than FMV. The Department conducted a verification of NMB/Pelmec's response for this period of review. In this review, we preliminarily determine that NMB/Pelmec has not sold BBs at less than FMV, which will satisfy the three-year period of no sales at less than FMV. Therefore, we intend to revoke the order with respect to BBs from Thailand, based on our preliminary determination that NMB/Pelmec is the only known producer of BBs, if these preliminary findings are affirmed in our final results.

United States Price

In calculating United States price (USP), the Department used purchase price (PP) or exporter's sales price (ESP), as defined in section 772 of the Tariff Act, as appropriate.

Due to the extremely large number of transactions that occurred during the POR and the resulting administrative burden involved in calculating individual margins for all of these transactions, we sampled sales to calculate USP, in accordance with section 777A of the Tariff Act. When a firm made more than 2,000 ESP sales transactions to the United States for a particular class or kind of merchandise, we reviewed ESP sales which occurred during sample weeks. We selected one week from each two-month period in the review period, for a total of six weeks, and analyzed each transaction made in those six weeks. The sample weeks included June 27-July 3, 1993, July 4-10, 1993, October 10-16, 1993, November 7-13, 1993, February 13-19, 1994, and April 24-30, 1994. We reviewed all PP sales transactions during the POR because there were few PP sales.

USP was based on the packed f.o.b., c.i.f., or delivered price to unrelated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. We made deductions, as appropriate, from PP and ESP for movement expenses, discounts, and rebates.

We made additional deductions from ESP for direct selling expenses, indirect selling expenses, and repacking in the United States.