

explained to us that the requested information at its Sarma facility could not be transported to Paris for the purpose of verification. SKF France had ample opportunity to notify us in advance so we could plan a visit to these two locations for a further verification but it did not do so.

Section 776(b) of the Act provides that the Department may use as adverse facts available information derived from the petition, a final determination in an antidumping investigation, any previous review, or any other information placed on the record. The statute does not provide a clear obligation or preference for relying on a particular source in choosing information to use as adverse facts available, but the Department may use as facts available a final determination in an less-than-fair-value proceeding even if the less-than-fair-value determination is based on the best information available (BIA). *See Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Sweden: Final Results of Administrative Review*, 62 FR 18396, 18402 (April 15, 1997), and *Certain Cut-to-Length Carbon Steel Plate from Mexico: Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review*, 63 FR 48181, 48183 (September 9, 1998).

For SKF France, we used the highest rate from a prior segment of the hearing, 66.42 percent, and applied it exclusively to Sarma's U.S. sales as adverse facts available. This rate was calculated for SKF France in the less-than-fair-value investigation. *See Antidumping Duty Orders: Ball Bearings, Cylindrical Roller Bearings, Spherical Plain Bearings, and Parts Thereof from France*, 54 FR 20902 (May 15, 1989). In this case, we were able to corroborate the 66.42 percent margin. Because section 777(b)(1)(A) of the Act prohibits us from discussing the business proprietary information we used in our corroboration of this rate in this notice, please see the SKF France Final Results Analysis Memorandum dated June 6, 2003, for a complete description of our corroboration methodology.

#### Other Changes Since the Preliminary Results

Based on our analysis of comments received, we have made revisions that have changed the results for certain firms. We have corrected programming and clerical errors in the preliminary results, where applicable. Any alleged programming or clerical errors about which we or the parties do not agree are discussed in the relevant sections of the Decision Memo, which is accessible on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/>

*index.html* and is on file in the CRU, Room B-009.

#### Final Results of the Reviews

We determine that the following percentage weighted-average margins on ball bearings exist for the period of May 1, 2001, through April 30, 2002:

Company	Margin (percent)
<b>FRANCE</b>	
SNR Roulements .....	3.52
SKF .....	10.08
<b>GERMANY</b>	
FAG .....	1.45
Torrington .....	70.41
Paul Mueller .....	0.19
SKF .....	3.38
<b>ITALY</b>	
FAG .....	2.87
SKF .....	5.08
<b>JAPAN</b>	
Koyo .....	4.98
NTN .....	4.51
NPBS .....	4.21
Sapporo .....	5.97
NSK, Ltd. ....	2.68
<b>SINGAPORE</b>	
NMB/Pelmec .....	1.62

#### Rescission of the Review in Part

In the *Preliminary Results for Japan*, we stated our intent 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 ball bearings from Japan. *See* 68 FR at 11357-58. We hereby affirm our preliminary findings regarding this matter and we are rescinding the reviews with respect to these Japanese trading companies in these final results.

We are also rescinding the administrative review we initiated of Taisei Industries, Ltd. (Taisei). Since the preliminary results, Taisei has supplied information to the Department supporting its claim that its suppliers had knowledge at the time of sale to Taisei that their ball bearings were destined for exportation to the United States. Subsequently, we find that Taisei is not the proper party to review with respect to the sales in question. Therefore, we are also rescinding the administrative review with respect to sales made by Taisei.

The discussion of issues and comments pertaining to these trading

companies is contained in the "Resellers" section of the Decision Memo, which is accessible on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html> and is on file in the CRU, Room B-009.

#### Revocation of Order in Part

In the *Preliminary Results for France*, et al, we stated our intent to revoke the order on ball bearings from Germany in part with respect to Paul Mueller. *See* 68 FR at 6405-06. We find that, because Paul Mueller did not sell ball bearings to the United States in commercial quantities during the first period for which we conducted an administrative review (1998-1999), the regulatory requirement for revocation has not been satisfied. *See* 19 CFR 351.222(d)(1). Accordingly, we reverse our preliminary intent to revoke the order in part with respect to Paul Mueller and are not revoking the antidumping duty order in part with respect to Paul Mueller in these final results of review.

The discussion of issues and comments pertaining to our decision not to revoke is contained in the "Revocation" section of the Decision Memo, which is accessible on the Web at <http://ia.ita.doc.gov/frn/index.html> and is on file in the CRU, Room B-009.

#### Assessment Rate

The Department will determine, and the U.S. Bureau of Customs and Border Protection (Customs), formerly known as the U.S. Customs Service, shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. We will issue appropriate assessment instructions directly to Customs within 15 days of publication of these final results of reviews. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.212(b)(1), we have calculated, whenever possible, an exporter/importer-specific assessment rate or value for subject merchandise.

##### a. Export Price

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

##### b. Constructed Export Price

For constructed export-price (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