(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,

Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce (*Hearing Transcript*)).

The Department has now completed this changed circumstances review in accordance with section 751(b) and 782(h) of the Act. *See also* 19 C.F.R. § 355.25(d)(1)(i).

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 this changed circumstances review in accordance with section 751(b) and has determined to revoke the countervailing duty order on ball bearings from Thailand 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 Review

Imports covered by this review are ball bearings and parts thereof from Thailand. 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 only. The written description remains dispositive.

Analysis of Comments

Comment 1: Torrington states that the opposition to revocation of the CVD order by five out of ninety-five U.S. producers is insufficient under relevant administrative precedent. In *Oregon Steel Mills Inc.* v. *United States,* an order was revoked notwithstanding the opposition of a single producer (out of seven) who had requested and participated in an administrative review. 862 F.2d 1541, 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1988). In this case, not one of seven, but five out of ninety-five companies have expressed opposition to revocation of the order covering Thailand. In the circumstances of this case, Torrington concludes that the industry as a whole supports the revocation of the order.

The Objecting Parties argue that petitioner's reliance on *Oregon Steel Mills* in support of the proposition that the Department may revoke an order for lack of interest despite opposition by a domestic party is inappropriate. In that case, only one domestic party objected to revocation, while the rest of the industry actively advocated revocation for lack of interest. While Torrington emphasizes that merely five of an estimated ninety-five domestic producers have objected to the revocation with respect to the Thailand CVD order, Torrington is the only domestic party to express a lack of interest in these cases. Pursuant to section 782(h) of the Act, the Department may only revoke a CVD order for lack of interest if ''producers accounting for substantially all of the production of that domestic like product, have expressed a lack of interest in the order.'' 19 U.S.C. § 1677m(h). The Objecting Parties argue that the Department cannot conclude that the domestic industry is no longer interested in the CVD order if parties which account for a significant portion of domestic production continue to favor maintenance of the order. In this case, they believe that the domestic interested parties actively opposing revocation account for roughly 50 percent of domestic production of the like product. Therefore, due to this opposition by a significant portion of the domestic industry, the Objecting Parties assert that the Department should not revoke this order for lack of interest.

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 order on ball bearings from Thailand 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 Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit 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 order. *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 order. First, the CVD investigation of ball bearings from Thailand was 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 order was imposed on ball bearings from Thailand, the objecting parties did not participate in any of the subsequent administrative reviews. None of the objecting parties demonstrated any interest in the CVD order after its imposition until the Department published its intent to revoke this order. Also, at the October 26, 1995 public hearing, parties stated that the purpose behind their opposition to the revocation of the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand is the access it provides them to expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews under section 753(e) of the Act of the AD and CVD 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 for the revocation of the AD and CVD orders on AFBs and TRBs. (*See Hearing Transcript*, at 52–3, 94).

The Objecting Parties have made it clear that their interest in this order 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 relief provided by the order. As such, we do not consider the Objecting Parties to be domestic producers for purposes of section 782(h)(2) of the Act or section 355.25(d)(1)(i) of our regulations. As a result, the Department finds the objections to revocation without merit. Accordingly, we find that Torrington's expression of no further interest in the continuation of the order meets the criteria for revocation presented in section 782(h)(2) of the Act and section 355.25(d)(1)(i) of our regulations. (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 over the course of the original AFBs investigations of nine countries, including the CVD investigation that involved Thailand, various of the objecting companies opposed the imposition of antidumping duties and argued that the domestic industry was not injured by imported bearings. In the years since the original investigations, none of the Objecting Parties filed an entry of appearance or participated in the administrative reviews with respect to the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand. Thus, according to Torrington, it is clear that the current opposition to revocation is a pretext for expediting the sunset reviews of the seventeen AD and CVD orders pursuant to section 753(e) of the Act. Torrington claims that the Objecting Parties' interests, as established over seven years devoted to opposition to the orders that cover their parent companies, are in the termination of these AD and CVD orders. As revealed by their requests for expedited sunset reviews, none of the companies opposing revocation are acting in their capacity as U.S. manufacturers or on behalf of their U.S. workers. As such, Torrington asserts that these companies lack standing to object to revocation of the CVD order covering Thailand.

Objecting Parties respond that their non-participation in the Thailand CVD proceedings over the past several years is no different from the non-participation of other U.S. producers in numerous other reviews. Neither the statute nor the regulations require so much as a request for review, much less active participation, on the part of the petitioner or any other domestic producer. All that is required, allege the Objecting Parties, is that an interested party express an interest in the continuation of the order, which they have done, so as to prevent its revocation. The Objecting Parties urge that Torrington's argument suggesting some extra-statutory, extra-regulatory standards be rejected.

In rebutting Torrington's argument that the Objecting Parties have objected to revocation only as a pretext to expedite sunset reviews of other AD and CVD orders, the Objecting Parties invite the Department to look at Torrington's actions and motives. Given Torrington's long-standing interest in the CVD order covering Thailand, the only logical explanation for Torrington's action is that its request for revocation was filed in order to preclude SKF and the others from requesting injury determinations under section 753(a) and expedited sunset reviews under section 753(e) of the Act. Obviously, without an order in place, a section 753(a) investigation is moot and, accordingly, expedited sunset reviews cannot be requested. Thus, according to these parties, Torrington has only sought to revoke the CVD order on Thailand so as to eliminate the possibility of expedited sunset reviews.

Department's Position: The fact that none of the Objecting Parties have participated in any of the previous administrative reviews of this order does not, in and of itself, preclude them from objecting to the revocation of this order. However, as discussed in our response to Comment 1, whether the objections should be recorded depends upon whether the Objecting Parties have a common ''stake'' with the petitioner in the relief provided by the order. *See Citrosuco Paulista*, 704 F. Supp. at 1085. There is no indication that the interests, or stake, of the Objecting Parties have changed since the investigations in this case and the antidumping duty cases concerning bearings from nine countries, during which the parties actively opposed the imposition of countervailing duties and antidumping duties sought by the petitioner, and argued that the domestic industry was not injured by imports of bearings. On the contrary, in this proceeding one of the Objecting Parties has stated, ''[o]ur interest is clearly to have an expedited [sunset] investigation, and in that investigation we will likely be arguing that those orders should be revoked because of the factual situation.'' (*See Hearing Transcript*, at 52). ''The intent of the Objecting Parties with respect to obtaining expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews for the orders affecting twelve countries including the ones in which their parent companies are located contradicts the argument made by these parties that they are acting in their capacity as domestic producers. 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 producers or 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. 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 cannot lawfully be considered domestic producers for purposes of the no-interest revocation issue.

Torrington admits that its request for revoking the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand is designed to prevent the sunset reviews on the AD and CVD orders covering AFBs and TRBs from all countries 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 order on ball bearings from Thailand in order to safeguard, at least for the time being, the broader relief afforded the domestic industry by the AD and CVD orders on AFBs and TRBs from Thailand as well as from the other countries. Conversely, the Objecting Parties have made it clear that their interest in this order 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 relief provided by this order.

Comment 3: Torrington claims that the objecting companies are not acting in the capacity of ''a manufacturer, producer, or wholesaler in the United States of a domestic like product.'' 19 U.S.C. § 1677(9)(C). Rather, in the unique circumstances of this case, each is acting on behalf of, and for the benefit

of, a foreign producer or exporter of AFBs and/or TRBs. CVD orders are intended to benefit U.S. manufacturers and their workers whose true interests are in obtaining relief from unfairly traded imports. Likewise, Torrington argues that only U.S. producers and manufacturers have standing to oppose revocation of a CVD order. The objecting companies are acting under the direct or indirect control of their foreign-parent companies in a manner ''differently than a nonrelated producer.'' 19 U.S.C. § 1677(4)(B)(ii)(IV). Hence, the entities should be collapsed for the purpose of determining whether they are foreign producers under § 1677(9)(A) or U.S. producers under § 1677(9)(C). According to Torrington, the Department has routinely collapsed these very companies and their foreign parents into single entities over the past years for purposes of calculating exporter's sales price. It follows, therefore, that as a ''single entity,'' the objecting companies cannot both be foreign manufacturers for purposes of 19 U.S.C. § 1677(9)(A) and also U.S. manufacturers for purposes of 19 U.S.C. § 1677(9)(C). Petitioner concludes that their fundamental interests, whether as a U.S. or foreign producer, should control their status.

The Objecting Parties claim that under the Department's regulations, a domestic producer's position as an importer or as related to a foreign producer of the subject merchandise is irrelevant to the question of revocation. A request for revocation, and opposition thereto, may be made by any domestic interested party specified in the Department's regulations. These parties assert that the language of the Department's regulations and the statute's definition of domestic interested party are clear: the companies fall squarely within the regulations and statute as a domestic ''interested party'' entitled to oppose revocation. Further, they argue that Torrington's references to the statute are misplaced because they incorrectly claim that these companies have no standing as a domestic manufacturer and, therefore, cannot oppose revocation of the Thailand order. The cited statutory and regulatory provisions which define ''interested party'' make no reference to whether a U.S. producer is or is not related to a foreign producer. Rather, all that is required is production in the United States.

They also argue that the fact that the Department may collapse related parties for purposes of other sections of the statute (*e.g.*, calculation of exporter's sales price) is not relevant to the issue of the definition of ''interested party.'' The Objecting Parties argue that if mere relationship to a foreign producer were sufficient to disqualify a domestic producer from being an ''interested party'' under 19 C.F.R. § 355.2(i)(3), then Torrington itself would also be disqualified. In the sixth review of the AD order on AFBs from Germany, counsel for Torrington entered an appearance on behalf of Torrington and Torrington Nadellager GmbH, the latter being a German bearing company acquired by Torrington. As such, the Objecting Parties assert that mere relationship to a foreign entity cannot disqualify a U.S. producer.

Department's Position: As discussed in our response to Comment 1, above, 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 order on Thailand, and (iii) now seek to retain the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand only as a vehicle to obtain expedited section 751(c) sunset reviews at which time they will argue for the revocation of most, if not all, of the AD and CVD orders on AFBs and TRBs covering their related foreign companies. Thus, we conclude that the Objecting Parties cannot be said to have a common ''stake'' with the petitioner in the relief provided by the order.

Torrington does not deny that it is related to a foreign exporter of AFBs. However, Torrington was the petitioner in the original investigation and has acted consistent with the interests of a domestic producer of AFBs throughout the administrative reviews of this order. Both the statute and its legislative history make clear that domestic producers who are related to foreign exporters of subject merchandise may be included in the industry if their actions reflect their interests as domestic producers, not foreign producers or exporters. For example, section 771(4)(B) of the Act provides that in determining industry support for an AD petition, Commerce shall:

> disregard the position of domestic producers who oppose the petition, if such producers are related to foreign producers * * *, *unless such domestic producers demonstrate that their interests as domestic producers would be adversely affected by the imposition of an antidumping duty order.*

19 U.S.C. § 1673a(c)(4)(B) (1995) (emphasis added). *See also Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Portable Electric Typewriters (PETs) from Singapore*, 58 FR 43334 (August 16, 1993) (Brother, a foreign-owned U.S. manufacturer of PETs, brought an antidumping case covering imports of PETs by Smith Corona, which after many years as a U.S. manufacturer of PETs, started importing PETs from Singapore).

As explained in our response to Comment 1, this same line of reasoning can be applied to this case of no-interest revocation. Torrington's expression of no further interest in the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand is consistent with Torrington's previous role as petitioner. The actions of the Objecting Parties, on the other hand, derive from their relationships to producers of AFBs and TRBs in other countries covered by AD and CVD orders. Thus, they cannot be considered members of the domestic industry for purposes of this no-interest revocation.

Comment 4: Torrington argues that the Department's independent authority to revoke the order on the basis of ''other changed circumstances'' is appropriately invoked where, as here, the 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 duty orders. According to Torrington, in view of the past opposition of these companies to the AD duty orders, the objecting parties are clearly intending to expedite the sunset review proceedings for the benefit of foreign manufacturers and producers and against the interests of the domestic industry. Therefore, the Department should disregard such opposition and revoke the CVD order on Thailand.

Department's Position: We are revoking the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand because it is 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 Review and Revocation of Countervailing Duty Order

The Department has determined to revoke the CVD order on ball bearings from Thailand. Although we received objections to our preliminary determination to revoke the order, the Objecting Parties have made it clear that their interest in the order is neither aligned with that of petitioner nor made in their capacity as domestic producers. Rather, the Objecting Parties seek to retain this CVD order only as a vehicle to argue for revocation of all outstanding

CVD and AD orders on AFBs and TRBs through expedited sunset reviews. (*See* section 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 order 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.

This changed circumstances review 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 Review

The products covered by this review, ball bearings, mounted or unmounted, and parts thereof, constitute the following as outlined below.

Ball Bearings, Mounted or Unmounted, and Parts Thereof

These products include all antifriction bearings which employ balls as the rolling element. Imports of these products are classifiable under the following categories: antifriction balls; ball bearings with integral shafts; ball bearings (including radial ball bearings) and parts thereof; ball bearings 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 unit are subject to this review. Finished but unground or semi-ground balls are not included in the scope of this review. Imports of these products are currently 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

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. 96–11388 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

[C–557–806]

Extruded Rubber Thread From Malaysia; Extension of Time Limit for Countervailing Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for countervailing duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for preliminary and final results of the 1994 administrative review of the countervailing duty order on extruded rubber thread from Malaysia. This extension is made pursuant to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (hereinafter, ''the Act'').

EFFECTIVE DATE: May 8, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Judy Kornfeld or Lorenza Olivas, 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.

POSTPONEMENT: Under the Act, the Department may extend the deadline for completion of an administrative review if it determines that it is not practicable to complete the review within the statutory time limit of 365 days. See Memorandum to the File dated April 27, 1996. The Department finds that it is not practicable to complete the 1994 administrative review of extruded rubber thread from Malaysia within this time limit.

In accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act, the Department will extend the time for completion of the preliminary results of this review from a 245-day period to no later than a 365-day period.

Dated: April 30, 1996.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.

[FR Doc. 96–11392 Filed 5–7–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

[Docket No. 950222054–6119–02; I.D. 042296D]

RIN 0648–ZA15

Financial Assistance for Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessments to Encourage Research Projects for Improvement in the Stock Conditions of the Chesapeake Bay Fisheries

AGENCY: National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), Commerce.

ACTION: Notice of availability of funds.

SUMMARY: Approximately $540,000 in Fiscal Year (FY) 1996 funds is available through the NOAA/NMFS Chesapeake Bay Office to assist interested state fishery agencies, academic institutions, and other nonprofit organizations relating to cooperative research units in carrying out research projects to provide information for Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessments through cooperative agreements. About $70,000 of the base amount is available to initiate new projects in FY 1996, as described in this announcement, while the balance will be used to fund continuation projects begun in previous years. NMFS issues this notice describing the conditions