

351.222(b)(2), our preliminary margin calculations show that this firm sold BBs at not less than normal value during the current review period. See dumping margins below. In addition, it sold BBs at not less than normal value in the two previous administrative reviews in which it was involved. See *Antifriction Bearings (Other Than Tapered Roller Bearings) and Parts Thereof from France, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part*, 65 FR 49219 (Aug. 11, 2000), covering the period May 1, 1998, through April 30, 1999, and *Ball Bearings and Parts Thereof from France, et al; Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Reviews and Revocation of Orders in Part*, 67 FR 55780 (Aug. 30, 2002), covering the period May 1, 2000, through April 30, 2001. Based on our examination of the sales data submitted by Paul Mueller, we preliminarily determine that Paul Mueller sold the subject merchandise in the United States in commercial quantities in each of the consecutive years cited by Paul Mueller to support its request for revocation, including the intervening unreviewed years. See preliminary results calculation memorandum for Paul Mueller, dated January 31, 2003, which is in the Department's CRU, Room B-099. Thus, we preliminarily find that Paul Mueller had zero or *de minimis* dumping margins for its last three administrative reviews and sold in commercial quantities in all years, including the unreviewed intervening years. Also, we preliminarily determine that application of the antidumping order to Paul Mueller is no longer warranted for the following reasons: (1) the company had zero or *de minimis* margins for a period of at least three consecutive years; (2) the company has agreed to immediate reinstatement of the order if the Department finds that it has resumed making sales at less than fair value; and (3) the continued application of the order is not otherwise necessary to offset dumping.

Therefore, we preliminarily determine that Paul Mueller qualifies for revocation of the order on BBs pursuant to 19 CFR 351.222(b)(2) and that the order with respect to merchandise produced and exported by Paul Mueller should be revoked.

If these preliminary findings are affirmed in our final results, we will revoke this order in part for Paul Mueller and, in accordance with 19 CFR 351.222(f)(3), we will terminate the suspension of liquidation for any of the merchandise in question that is entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after May 1, 2002,

and will instruct Customs to refund any cash deposits for such entries.

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 merchandise subject to a particular order, 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 SAA at 823-824, 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. When appropriate, 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 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 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 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 all firms 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 SKF France, SKF Germany, SKF Italy, FAG Germany, Paul Mueller, and NMB/Pelmecc dated January 31, 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. 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