organizations charged with economic policy-making responsibilities. Other data users include foreign countries, universities, financial analysts, unions, trade associations, public libraries, banking institutions, and U.S. and foreign corporations.

The Census Bureau has statutory authority granted in Title 13 USC, Section 91 and Public Law 105–252, signed into law by the President on October 9, 1998, to conduct the QFR program through September 30, 2005. This request is for extension of OMB approval.

Affected Public: Businesses or other for-profit organizations.

Frequency: Quarterly and annually.

Respondent's Obligation: Mandatory.

Legal Authority: Title 13 USC, Section 91 and P.L. 105–252.

OMB Desk Officer: Nancy Kirkendall, (202) 395–7313.

Copies of the above information collection proposal can be obtained by calling or writing Linda Engelmeier, DOC Forms Clearance Officer, (202) 482–3272, Department of Commerce, room 5327, 14th and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230.

Written comments and recommendations for the proposed information collection should be sent within 30 days of publication of this notice to Nancy Kirkendall, OMB Desk Officer, room 10201, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: October 28, 1998.

Linda Engelmeier,

Departmental Forms Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 98–29384 Filed 11–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–07–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–560–803]

Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Extruded Rubber Thread From Indonesia

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 3, 1998.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Morris or Eric B. Greynolds, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 4012, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–2786.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statue

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (''the Act''), are references to the provisions effective January 1, 1995, the effective date of the amendments made to the Act by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act (''URAA''). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR part 351 (April 1, 1998).

Preliminary Determination

We preliminarily determine that extruded rubber thread (''ERT'') from Indonesia is being, or is likely to be, sold in the United States at less than fair value (''LTFV''), as provided in section 733 of the Act. The estimated margins of sales at LTFV are shown in the ''Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

Case History

Since the initiation of this investigation on April 20, 1998 (*see Notice of Initiation of Antidumping and Countervailing Duty Investigations: Extruded Rubber Thread from Indonesia* (63 FR 23267) (''Notice of Initiation'')), the following events have occurred:

On April 22, 1998, the Department of Commerce (''Department'') requested information from the U.S. Embassy in Indonesia to identify producers/exporters of the subject merchandise.

On May 28, 1998, the International Trade Commission (''ITC'') published its preliminary determination that there is a reasonable indication that an industry in the United States is being materially injured, or threatened with material injury, by reason of imports from Indonesia of the subject merchandise (63 FR 29250).

On May 28, 1998, the Department issued the antidumping duty questionnaire to the following producers/exporters of ERT: P.T. Bakrie Rubber Industry (''Bakrie''), P.T. Swasthi Parama Mulya (''Swasthi''), P.T. Perkebunan Nusantara III (''Persero''), Cilatexindo Graha Alam P.T. (''Cilatexindo''). The questionnaire is divided into four sections. Section A requests general information concerning a company's corporate structure and business practices, the merchandise under investigation that it sells, and the sales of the merchandise in all of its markets. Sections B and C request home market sales listings and U.S. sales listings, respectively. Section D requests information on the cost of production (''COP'') of the foreign like product and constructed value (''CV'') of the subject merchandise.

On June 8, 1998 and July 27, 1998, Cilatexindo and Persero, respectively, stated that it has never directly or indirectly sold ERT to the U.S. market during the period of investigation. Upon receipt of Cilatexindo and Persero's statements, the Department consulted with U.S. Customs to verify each party's respective claim as it pertains to the period of investigation. The Department was able to confirm that both Cilatexindo and Persero did not ship the subject merchandise to the United States. (*See* Memorandum from Russell Morris to the File, ''Shipments of Subject Merchandise,'' dated August 24, 1998. The public version is on file in Room B–099, the Central Records Unit, of the Department of Commerce).

On July 8, 1998, Bakrie and Swasthi submitted their respective responses to Section A of the questionnaire. On July 21, 1998, Bakrie submitted Sections B and C of the questionnaire. On July 24, 1998, Swasthi submitted Sections B and C of the questionnaire. On August 17, 1998, we issued supplemental questionnaires to Bakrie and its affiliated U.S. reseller, Globe Manufacturing Co. (''Globe'') and Swasthi. On September 14, 1998, Swasthi submitted its response to the Department's Section C supplemental questionnaire. On September 25, 1998, Bakrie submitted its response to the Department's supplemental questionnaire for Sections A, B and C. On September 25, 1998, Bakrie also submitted its revised Section C questionnaire response which contained a separate submission of Globe's selling expenses and prices to its first unaffiliated customer.

On August 3, 1998, the petitioner made a timely request that the Department postpone the preliminary determination in this investigation. We did so on August 14, 1998, in accordance with section 733(c)(1)(A) of the Act (*see Notice of Postponement of Time Limit for Antidumping Investigation: Extruded Rubber Thread from Indonesia,* 63 FR 43674).

Date of Sale

On September 3, 1998, the petitioner objected to Swasthi's use of date of invoice as the date of sale. Petitioner argued that given the actual sales processes of Swasthi, the appropriate date of sale is set on the purchase order date for U.S. sales, not the date on which the sale is invoiced as Swasthi has reported. Petitioner noted that there are no changes in the basic terms of each sale after the negotiation of the purchase order. The petitioner noted

that its comment pertaining to the proper date of sale applies to Bakrie, as well. After a review of the petitioner's comments and the method by which sales are made in both the home market and U.S. market by both respondents, we determined that the date of invoice is the appropriate date of sale in this investigation.

Section 351.401(i) of the Department's regulations states that the Department will normally use the date of invoice, as recorded in the exporter's or producer's records kept in the ordinary course of business, as the date of sale. The preamble to the Final Rules (the ''Preamble'') provides an explanation of this policy and examples of when the Department may choose to base the date of sale on a date other than the date of invoice. *See* 62 FR at 27348–49 (May 19, 1997). According to Swasthi's response, the product mix, the price, and the quantity of a customer's original order can change until the date of shipment which is the same as the company's date of invoice. Based upon Swasthi's representation, we preliminarily determine that the appropriate date of sale for Swasthi is the date of shipment. In determining the date of sale for Bakrie and its affiliated reseller Globe, the Department is relying on Globe's reported invoice date as the date of sale and shipment date. (For further discussion see memorandum to the file, ''Clarification of Globe Manufacturing's Section C submission,'' dated October, 15, 1998.) We intend to verify respondents' claims concerning changes between the date of shipment and the date of invoice. Based upon the outcome of our verification, we will determine whether it is appropriate to continue to use the date of invoice as the date of sale. We will consider, among other things, whether, in fact, there were any changes to the contracted terms between the original order and the date of invoice. *See e.g. Notice of Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Canned Pineapple Fruit from Thailand*, 63 FR 7392 at 7394–7395 (February 13, 1998).

Cost Investigation

On August 17, 1998, pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act, petitioner submitted a timely allegation that Bakrie and Swasthi had made sales in the home market at less than the cost of production. Our analysis of the allegation indicated that there were reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that Bakrie and Swasthi both sold ERT in the home market at prices at less than COP. Accordingly, we initiated COP investigations with respect to Bakrie and Swasthi pursuant to section 773(b) of the Act on September 10, 1998 (*see* Memorandum from Team to David Mueller, Office Director, dated September 10, 1998. The public version is on file in Room B–099 of the Central Records Unit). As a result of the Department's COP investigation, the Department requested that both Bakrie and Swasthi answer Section D of the original questionnaire; both parties submitted their respective responses to the Section D questionnaire on October 23, 1998. Because of the timing of the COP initiation and the receipt of the COP responses, we are unable to include a COP analysis in this preliminary determination. We intend to issue COP analysis memoranda for Bakrie and Swasthi prior to verification and will conduct cost verifications for both respondents. Parties should include comments, if any, on our COP methodology in their case briefs.

Scope of the Investigation

For purposes of this investigation, the product covered is ERT from Indonesia. ERT is defined as vulcanized rubber thread obtained by extrusion of stable or concentrated natural rubber latex of any cross sectional shape, measuring from 0.18 mm, which is 0.007 inches or 140 gauge, to 1.42 mm, which is 0.056 inch or 18 gauge, in diameter.

ERT is currently classified under subheadings 4007.00.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (''HTS''). Although the HTS subheadings are provided for convenience and customs purposes, the written description of the scope of this investigation is dispositive.

Period of Investigation

The period of investigation (''POI'') is January 1, 1997, through December 31, 1997.

Postponement of Final Determination and Extension of Provisional Measures

In October 1998, pursuant to section 735(a)(2) of the Act, both respondents requested that, in the event of an affirmative preliminary determination in this investigation, the Department postpone its final determination until not later than 135 days after the date of the publication of an affirmative preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**. On October 27, 1998, respondents amended their request to include a request to extend the provisional measures to not more than six months. In accordance with 19 CFR 351.210(b), because (1) our preliminary determination is affirmative, (2) both Bakrie and Swasthi account for a significant proportion of exports of the subject merchandise, (3) no compelling reasons for denial exist, we are granting the respondents' request and are postponing the final determination until no later than 135 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. In addition, we are extending the provisional measures by not more than six months. Suspension of liquidation will be extended accordingly.

Fair Value Comparisons

To determine whether sales of ERT from Indonesia to the United States were made at less than fair value, we compared the export price (''EP'') or the constructed export price (''CEP'') to the normal value (''NV''), as described below in the ''Export Price,'' ''Constructed Export Price,'' and ''Normal Value'' sections of this notice. In accordance with section 777A(d)(1)(A)(i) of the Act, we calculated weighted-average EPs and CEPs for comparison to weighted-average NVs.

Physical Characteristics

In accordance with section 771(16) of the Act, we considered all products covered by the description in the ''Scope of Investigation'' section of this notice, produced in Indonesia by the respondents and sold in the home market during the POI, to be foreign like products for purposes of determining appropriate product comparisons to U.S. sales. Where there were no sales of identical merchandise in the home market to compare to U.S. sales, we compared U.S. sales to the most similar foreign like product on the basis of the characteristics listed in the Department's antidumping questionnaire. In making the product comparisons, we relied on the following criteria (listed in order of preference): gauge, color, and ends. (For further explanation of the product comparisons, *see* Memorandum from Anne D'Alauro dated May 22, 1998, on file in the Central Records Unit, Room B–099 of the Department of Commerce.)

Level of Trade

While neither Swasthi nor Bakrie claimed a difference in level of trade, Bakrie requested that the Department evaluate whether Bakrie qualified for a level of trade adjustment. Based upon our review of the responses submitted by each of the companies, we detected no sales activities that would differ from the home market to U.S. market, and therefore determine that each company performed essentially the same selling activities for all reported home market and U.S. sales. Accordingly, we find that no level of trade differences exist between any sales in either the home

market or U.S. market for either company. Therefore, all price comparisons are at the same level of trade and an adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act is unwarranted.

Export Price

For Swasthi, we used EP methodology, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the subject merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and because CEP methodology was not otherwise indicated. We based EP on the packed prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. In accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act, we made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for foreign inland freight, international freight, marine insurance, U.S. customs duty, and brokerage and handling. We also made a deduction, where appropriate, for rebates.

Constructed Export Price

For Bakrie, we used CEP methodology, in accordance with section 772(b) of the Act, because the first sale of subject merchandise to an unaffiliated purchaser took place after importation into the United States. We based CEP on the packed delivered prices to unaffiliated purchasers in the United States. We made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts. We also made deductions for the following movement expenses, where appropriate, in accordance with section 772(c)(2)(A) of the Act: foreign inland freight, containerization expenses (expenses for loading the merchandise into the container), foreign brokerage and handling, international freight (including marine insurance, U.S. inland insurance, U.S. freight to the affiliated reseller), U.S. customs duties, letter of credit fees, and freight to U.S. customer. In accordance with 772(d)(1) of the Act, we deducted selling expenses associated with economic activities occurring in the United States, including direct selling expenses (credit cost and technical services), inventory carrying costs, and other indirect selling expenses. Bakrie did not make a profit during the POI, therefore, profit was not deducted in accordance with sections 772(d)(3) and 772(f) of the Act.

In its response, Bakrie converted certain expenses originally incurred in Rupiah into U.S. dollars using an average exchange rate for the POI which was reported in its response. Because the company should have reported the charges in the currency of the transactions, we reconverted these expenses back into Rupiah using the average exchange rate used by the company.

In addition, in its initial questionnaire response, Bakrie and Globe failed to submit to the Department a single integrated Section C response. On August 17, 1998, we sent a supplemental questionnaire to both Bakrie and Globe, requesting that they submit a revised Section C response that integrated Bakrie's transfers of ERT to Globe and Globe's sales of ERT to its first unaffiliated customer in the United States. On September 25, 1998, Bakrie submitted a revised Section C questionnaire response. However, Bakrie's revised Section C response did not integrate its movement and other expenses associated with its shipments of ERT to Globe with that of Globe's sales of ERT to its first unaffiliated customer. The lack of an integrated response created gaps for which we did not have data.

Section 776(a)(2) of the Act provides that ''if an interested party or any other person fails to provide such information by the deadlines for submission of the information or in the form and manner requested, subject to subsections (c)(1) and (e) of section 782, the administering authority shall, subject to section 782(d), use the facts otherwise available in reaching the applicable determination under this title.'' In its August 17, 1998 supplemental questionnaire, the Department specifically requested that both Bakrie and its affiliated reseller, Globe, provide ''one integrated response.'' *See* the Department's Supplemental Questionnaire dated August 11, 1998, page 5. Both Bakrie and Globe failed to comply with the Department's request for an integrated response. On this basis, we determined that use of facts available is appropriate for certain expenses reported by Bakrie and Globe. The Department relied on facts available to integrate and adjust certain selling expenses incurred by both Bakrie and Globe. Therefore, as facts available, we weight-averaged Bakrie's reported U.S. expenses for CEP sales and integrated them into Globe's reported response. *See* Memorandum from Team to the File ''Normal Value and Constructed Export Price Adjustments for the Preliminary Determination,'' dated October 27, 1998.

In addition, according to Bakrie, Globe provided some technical services to its U.S. customers. However, Globe reported these expenses as part of its indirect selling expenses. Because we are unable to segregate these technical service expenses from other indirect selling expenses incurred in the United States as reported by Globe, we are treating, as facts available, the entire amount as direct selling expenses.

Normal Value

After testing for home market viability, we calculated NV as noted in the ''Price-to-Price Comparisons'' section of this notice.

Home Market Viability

In order to determine whether there is a sufficient volume of sales in the home market to serve as a viable basis for calculating NV (*i.e.*, the aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product is equal to or greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the respondents' volume of home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of the subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. As respondents' aggregate volume of home market sales of the foreign like product exceeded five percent of their aggregate volume of U.S. sales for the subject merchandise, we have determined that the home market is viable for both of the respondents.

Bakrie

We based NV on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for inland freight, inland insurance, and direct selling expenses (credit expenses and commissions), pursuant to sections 773(a)(6)(B) and 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. We also made deductions, where appropriate, for discounts. In addition, pursuant to sections 773(a)(6) (A) and (B) of the Act, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs.

While Bakrie reported in its response that it sold identical products in both its home and U.S. markets, identical product sales were not made during the POI. Thus, we had to match U.S. products to the most similar product sold in the home market based upon the matching criteria noted in the ''Physical Characteristics'' section of this notice. Bakrie, however, failed to provide information which could be used to make adjustments for physical differences in merchandise pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act. Therefore, we compared Bakrie's sales in the U.S. market to sales in the home market of products at the next highest gauge, as facts available, because the prices and costs per unit of weight are higher for the higher gauged ERT products.

Swasthi

We based NV on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers. We made deductions, where appropriate, from the starting price for inland freight in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B)(ii) of the Act. We also adjusted for differences in circumstances of sale for credit expenses pursuant to section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act. In addition, pursuant to sections 773(a)(6) (A) and (B) of the Act, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs.

Swasthi reported that it had returns of subject merchandise during the POI. On certain specific home market sales, it reported the quantity of the merchandise returned by the customer. Swasthi did not, however, report any additional expenses it incurred as a result of the return of defected and rejected merchandise. Therefore, we were unable to make any adjustments for any expenses incurred under this claim. We did, however, adjust the reported quantity of the home market sale based upon the quantity of the merchandise returned by the customer.

Currency Conversion

We made currency conversions into U.S. dollars based on the exchange rates in effect on the dates of the U.S. sales as certified by the Federal Reserve Bank, in accordance with section 773(A) of the Act.

In the recently completed preliminary determination of *Mushrooms from Indonesia,* an issue was raised regarding the use of two averaging periods for the margin calculations to account for the effect of the devaluation of the Indonesian Rupiah. *See Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Certain Preserved Mushrooms From Indonesia,* 63 FR 41783 (August 5, 1998) (*Mushrooms from Indonesia*). The petitioners in *Mushrooms from Indonesia* stated that the Department should calculate the weighted-average export price for two averaging periods—January through June 1997, and July through December 1997—in order to avoid distorting dumping margins. In *Mushrooms from Indonesia,* we preliminarily found no basis to depart from our practice of calculating the weighted-average export prices for the entire POI. Although the issue of using two different averaging periods has not been raised in the instant investigation, the effect, if any, of the devaluation of the Rupiah on margin calculations could also be relevant to this investigation because its POI, calendar year 1997, is identical to that in *Mushrooms from Indonesia.* Therefore, we will continue to examine this issue for our final determination in this instant investigation. We invite comments from the interested parties on this issue.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we will verify all information relied upon in making our final determination.

Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 733(d) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to suspend liquidation of all imports of subject merchandise that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Swasthi is excluded from suspension of liquidation because its rate is *de minimis* under section 733(b)(3) of the Act. We will instruct the Customs Service to require a cash deposit or the posting of a bond equal to the weighted-average amount by which the NV exceeds the export or constructed export price, as indicated in the chart below for companies other than Swasthi. These suspension-of-liquidation instructions will remain in effect until further notice. The weighted-average dumping margins are as follows:

Exporter/Manufacturer	Weighted-average margin Percentage
Bakrie Rubber Industry	13.07
P.T. Swasthi Parama Mulya	0.09
All Others Rate	13.07

Pursuant to section 735(c)(5)(A) of the Act, the Department has excluded all zero and *de minimis* weighted-average dumping margins from the calculation of the ''All Others'' rate. Under section 733(b)(3) of the Act, a weighted-average dumping margin is *de minimis* if it is less than two percent *ad valorem.*

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 733(f) of the Act, we have notified the ITC of our determination. If our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will determine before the later of 120 days after the date of this preliminary determination or 45 days after our final determination whether these imports are materially injuring, or threatening material injury to, the U.S. industry.

Public Comment

Case briefs or other written comments in at least ten copies must be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration no later than February 3, 1999, and rebuttal briefs no later than February 10, 1999. A list of authorities used and an executive summary of issues should accompany any briefs submitted to the Department. Such summary should be limited to five pages total, including footnotes. In accordance with section 774 of the Act, we will hold a public hearing, if requested, to afford interested parties an opportunity to comment on arguments raised in case or rebuttal briefs. Tentatively, the hearing will be held on February 16, 1999, time and room to be determined, at the U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230. Parties should confirm by telephone the time, date, and place of the hearing 48 hours before the scheduled time.

Interested parties who wish to request a hearing, or to participate if one is requested, must submit a written request to the Assistance Secretary for Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, Room 1870, within 30 days of the publication of this notice. Requests should contain: (1) The party's name, address, and telephone number; (2) the number of participants; and (3) a list of the issues to be discussed. Oral presentations will be limited to issues raised in the briefs. If this investigation proceeds normally, we will make our final determination by no later than 135 days after the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 733(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: October 27, 1998.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 98–29441 Filed 11–2–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Louisiana State University; Notice of Decision on Application for Duty-Free Entry of Scientific Instrument

This decision is made pursuant to Section 6(c) of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Pub. L. 89–651, 80 Stat. 897; 15 CFR part 301). Related records can be viewed between 8:30 A.M. and 5:00 P.M. in Room 4211, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th and