COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the New Hampshire Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a meeting of the New Hampshire Advisory Committee to the Commission will convene at 1 p.m. and adjourn at 5 p.m. on Monday, March 17, 2003, at the Southern New Hampshire University, 2500 North River Road, Manchester, New Hampshire 03106. The purpose of the meeting is to hold new member orientation, be briefed by invited guests on civil rights issues in New Hampshire, and plan future activities.

Persons desiring additional information, or planning a presentation to the Committee, should contact Aonghas St. Hilaire of the Eastern Regional Office, 202–376–7533 (TDD 202–376–8116). Hearing-impaired persons who will attend the meeting and require the services of a sign language interpreter should contact the Regional Office at least ten (10) working days before the scheduled date of the meeting.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated at Washington, DC, March 4, 2003.

Ivy L. Davis,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 03–5589 Filed 3–7–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS

Agenda and Notice of Public Meeting of the New York Advisory Committee

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, that a conference call of the New York Advisory Committee to the Commission will begin at 2 p.m. and end at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, March 26, 2003. This conference call is available to the public through the following call-in number: 1–800–659–1203, access code: 15778611. Any interested member of the public may call this number and listen to the meeting. The purpose of the conference call is to plan a community forum on civil rights issues and post 9/11 law enforcement-community relations in New York.

To ensure that the Commission secures an appropriate number of lines, persons are asked to register by contacting Aonghas St. Hilaire of the Eastern Regional Office, 202–376–7533 (TDD 202–376–8116), by 4 p.m. on Tuesday, March 25, 2003.

The meeting will be conducted pursuant to the provisions of the rules and regulations of the Commission.

Dated in Washington, DC, March 4, 2003.

Ivy L. Davis,

Chief, Regional Programs Coordination Unit.

[FR Doc. 03–5590 Filed 3–7–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6335–01–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–588–804]

Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof From Japan: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review, Partial Rescission of Administrative Review, and Notice of Intent To Rescind Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review, partial rescission of administrative review, and notice of intent to rescind administrative review.

SUMMARY: In response to requests from interested parties, the Department of Commerce is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan. The review covers six manufacturers/exporters and the period is May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below normal value by various companies subject to this review. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on all appropriate entries.

We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. Parties who submit comments in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 10, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Please contact the appropriate case analysts for the various respondent firms, as listed below, at Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–4733; Thomas Schauer (Koyo), Lyn Johnson (NTN), David Dirstine (NPBS), Dmitry Vladimirov (Sapporo), Catherine Cartsos (Taisei Trading Company), Kristin Case (NSK), Mark Ross, or Richard Rimlinger.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On May 15, 1989, the Department published in the **Federal Register** the antidumping duty order on ball bearings and parts thereof from Japan (54 FR 20904). On June 25, 2002, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b), we published a notice of initiation of administrative review of this order (67 FR 42753).

On October 23, 2002, the Department rescinded the administrative review with respect to Asahi Seiko Co., Ltd., and Nachi-Fujikoshi Corporation with respect to ball bearings from Japan. *See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al.: Partial and Full Rescission of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews,* 67 FR 65089 (Oct. 23, 2002).

On August 9, 2002, we received a timely withdrawal of the request for review of Shinyei Kaisha from Japan. Because there were no other requests for review of this firm, we are rescinding the review with respect to this company in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(d). The Department inadvertently neglected to include this firm in its October 23, 2002, notice.

We also initiated administrative reviews of Kitanihon Seiko, Co. Ltd., Sapporo Precision, Inc., and Sanbi Co., Ltd. In response to our questionnaires to these three entities, we received one consolidated response in which the companies explained their affiliations with one another. Given these affiliations, we have calculated a single weighted average margin for their sales in the United States and refer to them collectively as ''Sapporo'' throughout this notice. *See* analysis memorandum dated March 3, 2003, for a more detailed explanation.

We intend to rescind the administrative reviews we initiated of Jiro Okayama, Eisho Trading Co., Ltd., and Phoenix International Corporation (collectively ''Japanese trading companies'') with respect to subject merchandise from Japan. These Japanese trading companies informed us that, although they are the resellers of Japanese-manufactured ball bearings, their suppliers knew at the time of sale that the merchandise was destined for exportation to the United States. If in fact the suppliers had knowledge that

the sales they made to these trading companies were destined for exportation to the United States, then the suppliers would be the proper parties to an administrative review since their sales would be the point in the sales chain at which merchandise ''is first sold (or agreed to be sold) before the date of importation by the producer or exporter of the subject merchandise outside of the United States to an unaffiliated purchaser in the United States or to an unaffiliated purchaser for exportation to the United States * * *'' pursuant to section 772(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act).

Although another firm, Taisei Industries, Ltd. (Taisei), claimed that its suppliers ''generally'' have knowledge at the time of sale to Taisei that the ball bearings were destined for exportation to the United States, information on the record indicates that one of Taisei's suppliers did not know that the merchandise was being exported to the United States. Therefore, we have preliminarily included these sales in our administrative review of Taisei. We will seek further clarification concerning Taisei's sales to the United States and the knowledge of its suppliers concerning the ultimate disposition of the ball bearings prior to completing our final results of review.

On January 31, 2003, the Department extended the time limit for the preliminary results of this review to March 3, 2003. *See Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from Japan; Notice of Extension of Time Limit for Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review,* 68 FR 6113 (Feb. 6, 2003).

Scope of Review

The products covered by this review are ball bearings and parts thereof. These products include all antifriction bearings that employ balls as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classified under the following categories: antifriction balls, ball bearings with integral shafts, ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof, and housed or mounted ball bearing units and parts thereof.

Imports of these products are classified under the following *Harmonized Tariff Schedules* (HTSUS) subheadings: 3926.90.45, 4016.93.00, 4016.93.10, 4016.93.50, 6909.19.5010, 8431.20.00, 8431.39.0010, 8482.10.10, 8482.10.50, 8482.80.00, 8482.91.00, 8482.99.05, 8482.99.2580, 8482.99.35, 8482.99.6595, 8483.20.40, 8483.20.80, 8483.50.8040, 8483.50.90, 8483.90.20, 8483.90.30, 8483.90.70, 8708.50.50, 8708.60.50, 8708.60.80, 8708.70.6060, 8708.70.8050, 8708.93.30, 8708.93.5000, 8708.93.6000, 8708.93.75, 8708.99.06, 8708.99.31, 8708.99.4960, 8708.99.50, 8708.99.5800, 8708.99.8080, 8803.10.00, 8803.20.00, 8803.30.00, 8803.90.30, and 8803.90.90.

The size or precision grade of a bearing does not influence whether the bearing is covered by the order. For a listing of scope determinations which pertain to the order, see the Scope Determinations Memorandum (Scope Memorandum) from the Antifriction Bearings Team to Laurie Parkhill, dated April 1, 2002, and hereby adopted by this notice. The Scope Memorandum is on file in the Central Records Unit (CRU), Main Commerce Building, Room B–099, in the General Issues record (A–100–001) for the 01/02 review.

Although the HTSUS item numbers above are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this proceeding remains dispositive.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified information provided by certain respondents using standard verification procedures, including on-site inspection of the manufacturers' facilities, the examination of relevant sales and financial records, and the selection of original documentation containing relevant information. Our verification results are outlined in the public versions of the verification reports, which are on file in the CRU, Room B–099.

Export Price and Constructed Export Price

For the price to the United States, we used export price or constructed export price (CEP) as defined in sections 772(a) and (b) of the Act, as appropriate. Due to the extremely large volume of transactions that occurred during the period of review and the resulting administrative burden involved in calculating individual margins for all of these transactions, we sampled CEP sales in accordance with section 777A of the Act. When a firm made more than 10,000 CEP sales transactions to the United States of subject merchandise, we reviewed CEP sales that 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 are as follows: May 27–June 2, 2001; August 19–25, 2001; September 16–22, 2001; December 2–8, 2001; February 17–23, 2002; and March 24–30, 2002. We reviewed all export-price sales transactions made during the period of review.

We calculated export price and CEP based on the packed F.O.B., C.I.F., or delivered price to unaffiliated purchasers in, or for exportation to, the United States. We made deductions, as appropriate, for discounts and rebates. We also made deductions for any movement expenses in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act.

In accordance with section 772(d)(1) of the Act and the Statements of Administrative Action accompanying the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, H.R. Doc. 103–316, at 823–824 (1994), we calculated the CEP by deducting selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, which includes commissions, direct selling expenses, indirect selling expenses, and U.S. repacking expenses. For NPBS, in accordance with section 772(d)(2) of the Act, we also deducted the cost of any further manufacture or assembly, except where we applied the special rule provided in section 772(e) of the Act. *See* below. Finally, we made an adjustment for profit allocated to these expenses in accordance with section 772(d)(3) of the Act.

With respect to subject merchandise to which value was added in the United States prior to sale to unaffiliated U.S. customers, *e.g.*, parts of bearings that were imported by U.S. affiliates of foreign exporters and then further processed into other products which were then sold to unaffiliated parties, we determined that the special rule for merchandise with value added after importation under section 772(e) of the Act applied to all firms, except NPBS, that added value in the United States.

Section 772(e) of the Act provides that, when the subject merchandise is imported by an affiliated person and the value added in the United States by the affiliated person is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise, we shall determine the CEP for such merchandise using the price of identical or other subject merchandise sold by the exporter or producer to an unaffiliated person if there is a sufficient quantity of sales to provide a reasonable basis for comparison and we determine that the use of such sales is appropriate. If there is not a sufficient quantity of such sales or if we determine that using the price of identical or other subject merchandise is not appropriate, we may use any other reasonable basis to determine the CEP.

To determine whether the value added is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise, we

estimated the value added based on the difference between the averages of the prices charged to the first unaffiliated purchaser for the merchandise as sold in the United States and the averages of the prices paid for the subject merchandise by the affiliated purchaser. Based on this analysis, we determined that the estimated value added in the United States by all firms, with the exception of NPBS, accounted for at least 65 percent of the price charged to the first unaffiliated customer for the merchandise as sold in the United States. *See* 19 CFR 351.402(c) for an explanation of our practice on this issue. Therefore, we preliminarily determine that, for the firms other than NPBS, the value added is likely to exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise. Also, for those companies, we determine that there was a sufficient quantity of sales remaining to provide a reasonable basis for comparison and that the use of these sales is appropriate. *See* analysis memoranda for Koyo, NSK, and NTN dated February 28, 2003. Accordingly, for purposes of determining dumping margins for the sales subject to the special rule, we have used the weighted-average dumping margins calculated on sales of identical or other subject merchandise sold to unaffiliated persons.

For NPBS, we determined that the special rule did not apply because the value added in the United States did not exceed substantially the value of the subject merchandise. Consequently, NPBS submitted a complete response to our further-manufacturing questionnaire, which included the costs of the further processing performed by its U.S. affiliate, and we analyzed all sales.

No other adjustments to export price or CEP were claimed or allowed.

Normal Value

Based on a comparison of the aggregate quantity of home-market and U.S. sales and absent any information that a particular market situation in the exporting country did not permit a proper comparison, we determined that the quantity of foreign like product sold by all respondents in the exporting country was sufficient to permit a proper comparison with the sales of the subject merchandise to the United States, pursuant to section 773(a) of the Act. Each company's quantity of sales in its home market was greater than five percent of its sales to the U.S. market. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based normal value on the prices at which the foreign like products were first sold for consumption in the exporting country.

Due to the extremely large number of transactions that occurred during the period of review and the resulting administrative burden involved in examining all of these transactions, we sampled sales to calculate normal value in accordance with section 777A of the Act. When a firm had more than 10,000 home-market sales transactions, we used sales in sample months that corresponded to the sample weeks that we selected for U.S. CEP sales, sales in the month prior to the period of review, and sales in the month following the period of review. The sample months were April, May, August, September, and December of 2001, and February, March, and June of 2002.

We used sales to affiliated customers only where we determined such sales were made at arm's-length prices, *i.e.*, at prices comparable to prices at which the firm sold identical merchandise to unaffiliated customers.

Because we disregarded below-cost sales in accordance with section 773(b) of the Act in the last completed review with respect to ball bearings sold by Koyo, NPBS, NSK, and NTN (*see Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al.; Final Results of Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part,* 65 FR 49219, 49221 (Aug. 11, 2000), or *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al; Final Results of Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part,* 67 FR 55780, 55781 (Aug. 30, 2002)), we had reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that sales by these companies of the foreign like product under consideration for the determination of normal value in this review may have been made at prices below the cost of production (COP) as provided by section 773(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, pursuant to section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we conducted COP investigations of sales by these firms in the home market.

In accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act, we calculated the COP based on the sum of the costs of materials and fabrication employed in producing the foreign like product, the selling, general, and administrative (SG&A) expenses, and all costs and expenses incidental to packing the merchandise. In our COP analysis, we used the home-market sales and COP information provided by each respondent in its questionnaire responses.

After calculating the COP, in accordance with section 773(b)(1) of the Act, we tested whether home-market sales of the foreign like product were made at prices below the COP within an extended period of time in substantial quantities and whether such prices permitted the recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. We compared model-specific COPs to the reported home-market prices less any applicable movement charges, discounts, and rebates.

Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(c) of the Act, when less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than the COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because the below-cost sales were not made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time. When 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the period of review were at prices less than the COP, we disregarded the below-cost sales because they were made in substantial quantities within an extended period of time pursuant to sections 773(b)(2)(B) and (C) of the Act and, based on comparisons of prices to weighted-average COPs for the period of review, we determined that these sales were 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. Based on this test, we disregarded below-cost sales with respect to all of the above-mentioned companies.

We compared U.S. sales with sales of the foreign like product in the home market. We considered all non-identical products within a bearing family to be equally similar. As defined in our questionnaire, a bearing family consists of all ball bearings that are the same in the following physical characteristics: load direction, bearing design, number of rows of rolling elements, precision rating, dynamic load rating, outer diameter, inner diameter, and width.

Home-market prices were based on the packed, ex-factory, or delivered prices to affiliated or unaffiliated purchasers. When applicable, we made adjustments for differences in packing and for movement expenses in accordance with sections 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act. We also made adjustments for differences in cost attributable to differences in physical characteristics of the merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act and for differences in circumstances of sale in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410. For comparisons to export price, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from and adding U.S. direct selling expenses to

normal value. For comparisons to CEP, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from normal value. We also made adjustments, when applicable, for home-market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in export-price and CEP calculations.

In accordance with section 773(a)(1)(B)(i) of the Act, we based normal value, to the extent practicable, on sales at the same level of trade as the export price or CEP. If normal value was calculated at a different level of trade, we made an adjustment, if appropriate and if possible, in accordance with section 773(a)(7) of the Act. *See Level of Trade* section below.

In accordance with section 773(a)(4) of the Act, we used constructed value as the basis for normal value when there were no usable sales of the foreign like product in the comparison market. We calculated constructed value in accordance with section 773(e) of the Act. We included the cost of materials and fabrication, SG&A expenses, and profit in the calculation of constructed value. In accordance with section 773(e)(2)(A) of the Act, we based SG&A expenses and profit on the amounts incurred and realized by each respondent in connection with the production and sale of the foreign like product in the ordinary course of trade for consumption in the home market.

When appropriate, we made adjustments to constructed value in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act and 19 CFR 351.410 for circumstances-of-sale differences and level-of-trade differences. For comparisons to export price, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from and adding U.S. direct selling expenses to normal value. For comparisons to CEP, we made circumstances-of-sale adjustments by deducting home-market direct selling expenses from normal value. We also made adjustments, when applicable, for home-market indirect selling expenses to offset U.S. commissions in export-price and CEP comparisons.

When possible, we calculated constructed value at the same level of trade as the export price or CEP. If constructed value was calculated at a different level of trade, we made an adjustment, if appropriate and if possible, in accordance with sections 773(a)(7) and (8) of the Act. *See Level of Trade* section below.

Level of Trade

To the extent practicable, we determined normal value for sales at the same level of trade as the U.S. sales (either export price or CEP). When there were no sales at the same level of trade, we compared U.S. sales to home-market sales at a different level of trade. The normal-value level of trade is that of the starting-price sales in the home market. When normal value is based on constructed value, the level of trade is that of the sales from which we derived SG&A and profit.

To determine whether home-market sales are at a different level of trade than U.S. sales, we examined stages in the marketing process and selling functions along the chain of distribution between the producer and the unaffiliated customer. If the home-market sales were at a different level of trade from that of a U.S. sale and the difference affected price comparability, as manifested in a pattern of consistent price differences between the sales on which normal value is based and home-market sales at the level of trade of the export transaction, we made a level-of-trade adjustment under section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act. *See, e.g., Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from South Africa*, 62 FR 61731 (Nov. 19, 1997).

For a company-specific description of our level-of-trade analysis for these preliminary results, *see* Memorandum to Laurie Parkhill from Antifriction Bearings Team Regarding Level of Trade, dated March 3, 2003, on file in the CRU, Room B–099.

Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our review, we preliminarily determine the following percentage weighted-average dumping margins on ball bearings from Japan for the period May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002:

Company	Margin (percent)
Koyo	4.95
NTN	10.47
NPBS	6.17
Sapporo	7.59
NSK, Ltd	2.68
Taisei	35.18

Comments

Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.310(c), any interested party may request a hearing within 21 days of the date of publication of this notice. If requested, a hearing will be held at the main Commerce Department building at a time and location to be determined.

Issues raised in a hearing will be limited to those raised in the respective case and rebuttal briefs. Pursuant to 19 CFR 351.309(c)(ii), interested parties may submit case briefs within 30 days of the date of publication of this notice. Furthermore, as discussed in 19 CFR 351.309(d), rebuttal briefs, which must be limited to issues raised in the case briefs, may be filed within 5 days after the time limit for filing the case brief. Parties who submit case or rebuttal briefs in this proceeding are requested to submit with each argument (1) a statement of the issue, and (2) a brief summary of the argument with an electronic version included.

We are also conducting administrative reviews of the orders on ball bearings from other countries. *See Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, et al.: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews, Partial Rescission of Administrative Reviews, and Notice of Intent to Revoke Order in Part*, 68 FR 6404 (Feb. 7, 2003). Parties in the Japan-specific review who wish to raise general issues affecting all ongoing reviews of ball bearings from various countries should meet the following schedule regarding requests for a general issues hearing and briefs:

Request for Hearing: March 17, 2003
Case Briefs: March 24, 2003
Rebuttal Briefs: March 31, 2003

The Department will publish the final results of this administrative review, including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written briefs. The Department will issue final results of this review within 120 days of publication of these preliminary results.

Assessment Rates

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated, whenever possible, an exporter/importer (or customer)-specific assessment rate or value for subject merchandise.

Export-Price Sales

With respect to export-price sales, for these preliminary results we divided the total dumping margins (calculated as the difference between normal value and export price) for each exporter's importer/customer by the total number of units the exporter sold to that importer/customer. We will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting per-unit dollar amount against each unit of merchandise in each of that importer's/customer's entries during the review period.

Constructed Export Price Sales

For CEP sales (sampled and non-sampled), we divided the total dumping

margins for the reviewed sales by the total entered value of those reviewed sales for each importer. We will direct the Customs Service to assess the resulting percentage margin against the entered customs values for the subject merchandise on each of that importer's entries during the review period. *See* 19 CFR 351.212(b).

Cash-Deposit Requirements

To calculate the cash-deposit rate for each respondent (*i.e.*, each exporter and/or manufacturer included in this review), we divided the total dumping margins for each company by the total net value for that company's sales of merchandise during the review period.

In order to derive a single weighted-average margin for each respondent, we weight-averaged the export-price and CEP deposit rates (using the export price and CEP, respectively, as the weighting factors). To accomplish this when we sampled CEP sales, we first calculated the total dumping margins for all CEP sales during the review period by multiplying the sample CEP margins by the ratio of total days in the review period to days in the sample weeks. We then calculated a total net value for all CEP sales during the review period by multiplying the sample CEP total net value by the same ratio. Finally, we divided the combined total dumping margins for both export-price and CEP sales by the combined total value for both export-price and CEP sales to obtain the deposit rate.

Entries of parts incorporated into finished bearings before sales to an unaffiliated customer in the United States will receive the respondent's deposit rate applicable to the order.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective upon publication of the notice of final results of administrative review for all shipments of ball bearings from Japan entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication, as provided by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash-deposit rates for the reviewed companies will be the rates established in the final results of review; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash-deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the less-than-fair-value investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash-deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) the cash-deposit rate for all other manufacturers or exporters will continue to be 45.83 percent, the ''All Others'' rate made effective by the final results of review published on July 26, 1993. *See Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof From France, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation in Part of an Antidumping Duty Order*, 58 FR 39729.

These deposit requirements, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

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 Department's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of doubled antidumping duties.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 3, 2003.

Faryar Shirzad,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 03–5635 Filed 3–7–03; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–533–809]

Certain Forged Stainless Steel Flanges from India: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of preliminary results and partial rescission of antidumping duty administrative review.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 10, 2003.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Helen Kramer at (202) 482–0405 (Snowdrop Trading, Pvt. Ltd.), Shireen Pasha at (202) 482–0193 (Echjay Forgings Ltd./Pushpaman Exports), or Dena Aliadinov at (202) 482–3362 (Viraj Forgings, Ltd.), Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Ave, NW., Washington, DC 20230.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain forged stainless steel flanges from India (''SS flanges'') manufactured/exported by Echjay Forgings Pvt. Ltd. (''Echjay'') and Viraj Forgings Ltd. (''Viraj''), and exported by Snowdrop Trading Pvt. Ltd. (''Snowdrop''). The period of review (POR) covers the period February 1, 2001, through January 31, 2002. We have preliminarily determined, based in part on adverse facts available, that Echjay sold subject merchandise at less than normal value (''NV'') and that Viraj had a *de minimis* margin. Lastly, we have preliminarily determined to apply a facts available (''FA'') rate to Snowdrop's sale. If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct the U.S. Customs Service to assess antidumping duties on entries of the subject merchandise for which the importer-specific assessment rates are above *de minimis*. We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results. We request parties who submit argument in these proceedings to submit with the argument: (1) a statement of the issues and (2) a brief summary of the argument.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On February 9, 1994, the Department published the antidumping duty order on SS flanges (59 FR 5994). On February 1, 2002, the Department published a notice of opportunity to request an administrative review for this order covering the period February 1, 2001, through January 31, 2002 (67 FR 4945). On February 28, 2002, Snowdrop and Metal Forgings Rings & Bearings Pvt. Ltd. (''MF'') requested review in accordance with 19 CFR 351.213(b)(2), and the petitioners requested review of Bhansali Ferromet Pvt. Ltd. (''Bhansali''), Echjay, Isibars Ltd., Panchmahal Steel Ltd. (''Panchmahal''), Patheja Forgings and Auto Parts, Ltd. (''Patheja''), and Viraj under 19 CFR 351.213(b)(1). The petitioners are the Coalition Against Indian Flanges (Ideal Forging Corporation and Maass Flange Corporation). They have not participated further in this review. The Department initiated these reviews on March 27, 2002 (see Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Administrative Reviews and Requests for Revocations in Part, 67 FR 14696). The Department rescinded the review of Isibars on December 6, 2002, after