ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for preliminary results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the 1997–1998 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on cut-to-length carbon steel plate from Romania. The review covers one exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, Windmill International Romania Branch (Windmill), and the period August 1, 1997 through July 31, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Fred Baker at (202) 482–2924 or John Kugelman at (202) 482–0649, AD/CVD Enforcement Group III—Office 8, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department initiated this administrative review on September 29, 1998 (63 FR 51893). Under section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (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. Because of the complexity and difficulties presented with surrogate factor valuation in this case, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until August 31, 1999. See Memorandum from Joseph A. Spetrini to Robert S. LaRussa, on file in Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building. The deadline for the final results of this review will continue to be 120 days after publication of the preliminary results.

This extension is in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act and section 351.213(h)(2) of the Department's regulations.

Dated: March 19, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 99–7367 Filed 3–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–201–809]

Certain Cut-to-Length (CTL) Carbon Steel Plate From Mexico; Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Extension of Time Limit

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

ACTION: Notice of extension of time limit for preliminary determination in antidumping duty administrative review of certain CTL carbon steel plate from Mexico.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce (the Department) is extending the time limit for the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain CTL carbon steel plate from Mexico. This review covers the period August 1, 1997 through July 31, 1998.

EFFECTIVE DATES: March 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Heather Osborne or John Kugelman, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement, Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–3019 or 482–0649, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Beause it is not practicable to complete this review within the time limits mandated by the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the preliminary results until August 31, 1999, in accordance with section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act of 1994 (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(3)(A)). *See* memorandum to Robert S. LaRussa from Joseph A. Spetrini regarding the extension of the case deadline, dated March 17, 1999.

Dated: March 18, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Deputy Assistant Secretary, Enforcement Group III.

[FR Doc. 99–7370 Filed 3–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–M

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–560–803]

Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Extruded Rubber Thread from Indonesia

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Russell Morris or Eric B. Greynolds, Office of AD/CVD Enforcement VI, Group II, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482–1775 or (202) 482–6071, respectively.

The Applicable Statute

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 of Commerce (''Department'') regulations are to the regulations at 19 CFR Part 351 (April 1998).

Final Determination

We determine that extruded rubber thread (''ERT'') from Indonesia is being sold in the United States at less than fair value (''LTFV''), as provided in section 735 of the Act. The estimated margins are shown in the ''Suspension of Liquidation'' section of this notice.

Case History

Since the publication of our preliminary determination in this investigation (*see Notice of Preliminary Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value and Postponement of Final Determination: Extruded Rubber Thread from Indonesia;* 63 FR 59279, (October 27, 1998), (''Preliminary Determination'')), the following events have occurred:

In December 1998, we verified the sales questionnaire response from Globe Manufacturing Company (''Globe''), an affiliated selling agent of P.T. Bakrie Rubber Industries (''Bakrie''), a foreign respondent. Between January 7 through January 31, 1999, we verified the sales and cost questionnaire responses of the foreign respondents, Bakrie and P.T. Swasthi Parama Mulya (''Swasthi'').

Petitioner, North American Rubber Thread Co., Ltd., and respondents, Bakrie and Globe, submitted case briefs on February 26, 1999, and rebuttal briefs on March 2, 1999. Swasthi submitted a case brief on February 26, 1999, and a rebuttal brief on March 3, 1999. No party requested a public hearing for this investigation.

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 subheading 4007.00.00 of the *Harmonized Tariff Schedule* (''HTS''). Although the HTS subheading is 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.

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.

Product Comparisons

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 and color. In our preliminary determination we also made product comparisons using ends in our model match. At verification we learned that ends are not relevant to the product price of ERT. We also verified that there are no costs associated with the ends. Therefore, for purposes of the final determination, we have eliminated ends as a model match characteristic.

Level of Trade

In the preliminary determination, we determined that all comparisons are at the same level of trade for both respondents and an adjustment pursuant to section 773(a)(7)(A) of the Act is not warranted. We find no basis to change this determination for the final determination.

Export Price

As in the preliminary determination, for Swasthi we used EP methodology, in accordance with section 772(a) of the Act, because the merchandise was sold directly to the first unaffiliated purchaser in the United States prior to importation and 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.

In the course of preparing for verification, Swasthi discovered minor errors in its questionnaire responses. Swasthi reported these corrections to its questionnaire responses on the first day of verification. Upon examination of these minor corrections, we made the following revisions to Swasthi's U.S. sales database: (1) accepted a revised sales database which amended various fields (*see* Comment 4 in the ''Analysis of Comments Received'' section for further discussion); (2) revised the brokerage expenses (*see* Swasthi's Sales Verification Report); (3) revised the rebate calculation, where appropriate (*see* Swasthi's Sales Verification Report); and (4) recalculated imputed credit costs in the home and U.S. market in order to account for changes in the interest rates (*see* Swasthi's Sales Verification Report).

Constructed Export Price

For all sales by Bakrie, we used the 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, and freight to U.S. customer. In accordance with section 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) (*see* Comment 7), inventory carrying costs (*see* Comment 7), other indirect selling expenses.

Finally, during our verification of Globe, we learned that Globe incorrectly based its inventory carrying costs and indirect selling expenses on a nine-month period rather than on the entire POI. Thus, based on our verification findings, we revised the inventory carrying costs and indirect selling expenses in Bakrie's U.S. sales database in order to account for the entire POI. In addition, we revised the international freight expenses incurred in the United States and the inland freight expenses from the warehouse and created a new field in order to account for marine insurance expenses that were omitted from Bakrie's original section C response. For further discussion on the above-mentioned revisions, *see* Globe's Verification Report. In addition, we recalculated Bakrie's imputed credit expenses in the home and U.S. market in order to account for changes in the interest rates that we discovered at verification (*see* Bakrie and Globe's Sales Verification Report).

Normal Value

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 greater than five percent of the aggregate volume of U.S. sales), we compared the volume of each respondent's home market sales of the foreign like product to the volume of U.S. sales of subject merchandise, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(C) of the Act. Based on this comparison, we determined that each respondent had a viable home market during the POI.

Consequently, we based NV on home market sales.

As discussed in the preliminary determination, the Department found reasonable grounds to believe or suspect that both Bakrie's and Swasthi's sales in the home market were made at prices below the cost of producing the subject merchandise. As a result, the Department initiated an investigation to determine whether Bakrie and Swasthi had made home market sales during the POI at prices below their respective cost of production within the meaning of section 773(b) of the Act. Section 782(c)(2) of the Act provides that the Department must attempt to provide guidance to small responding companies. Because both respondents are small companies in Indonesia, acting on their own behalf, the Department has attempted to provide guidance in the course of responding to antidumping questionnaires. This, in turn, necessitated granting time to respond to the questionnaires. Due to these extensions, the Department was unable to include a cost of production (''COP'') analysis of either respondent's home market sales in the preliminary determination. However, we are including a COP analysis of Bakrie's and Swasthi's home market sales in this final determination.

Before making any fair value comparisons, we conducted the COP analysis described below for each company:

1. Bakrie

A. *Calculation of COP.* We calculated the COP based on the sum of Bakrie's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market selling, general and administrative expenses (''SG&A'') and packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act.

B. *Test of Home Market Prices.* We used the respondent's weighted-average COP for the POI. We compared the weighted-average COP figures to home market sales of the foreign like product as required under section 773(b) of the Act, in order to determine whether these sales had been made at below-cost prices within an extended period of time in substantial quantities, and whether the below-cost prices would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time. On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to the home market prices, less any applicable movement charges and direct selling expenses. We did not deduct indirect selling expenses from the home market price because these expenses were included in COP.

C. *Results of COP Test.* Pursuant to section 773(b)(2)(C) of the Act, where less than 20 percent of a respondent's sales of a given product were at prices less than COP, we did not disregard any below-cost sales of that product because we determined that the below-cost sales were not made in ''substantial quantities.'' Where 20 percent or more of a respondent's sales of a given product during the POI were at prices less than the COP, we determined such sales to have been made in ''substantial quantities'' within an extended period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(B) of the Act. In such cases, because we compared prices to weighted-average COPs for the POI, we also determined that such sales were not made at prices which would permit recovery of all costs within a reasonable period of time, in accordance with section 773(b)(2)(D) of the Act. Therefore, we disregarded the below-cost sales.

Based on our COP test, we found that Bakrie had no above-cost home market sales for matching purposes. (For further discussion, see the Calculation Memorandum to the File, dated March 18, 1999). Therefore, NV was based upon constructed value, pursuant to section 773(b)(1).

D. *Calculation of CV.* In accordance with section 773(e) of the Act, we calculated CV based on the sum of Bakrie's cost of materials, fabrication costs, SG&A, profit, and U.S. packing costs. We used Bakrie's actual selling expenses incurred in Indonesia on home market sales. Because Bakrie had no above-cost home market sales and, hence, no actual company-specific profit data available for its home market sales, we calculated profit in accordance with section 773(e)(2)(B) of the Act. Specifically, section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act permits the Department to use any other reasonable method to determine profit. Therefore, we used Swasthi's profit rate as facts available under section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act (*see* Comment 2).

E. *Price to CV Comparisons.* For price to CV comparisons, we made adjustments to CV in accordance with section 773(a)(8) of the Act. We deducted from CV the weighted-average home market direct selling expenses and added the weighted-average U.S. product-specific direct selling expenses, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(iii) of the Act.

2. Swasthi

A. *Calculation of COP.* We calculated the COP based on the sum of Swasthi's cost of materials and fabrication for the foreign like product, plus amounts for home market SG&A and packing costs in accordance with section 773(b)(3) of the Act.

B. *Test of Home Market Prices.* On a product-specific basis, we compared the COP to the home market prices, less any applicable movement charges and direct selling expenses. We did not deduct indirect selling expenses from the home market price because these expenses were included in the G&A portion of COP.

C. *Results of COP Test.* Based on our COP test and the methodology for disregarding below-cost sales described above for Bakrie, we found that Swasthi had sufficient above-cost home market sales for matching purposes. (For further discussion, *see* the Calculation Memorandum to the File, dated March 18, 1999). Therefore, for matching purposes, U.S. sales were compared to home market prices for all comparisons and CV was not required.

D. *Price to Price Comparisons.* We calculated NV based on packed, delivered prices to unaffiliated customers and prices to affiliated customers where the sales were made at arm's length. Where appropriate, we made deductions from the starting price (gross unit price) for foreign inland freight in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(B). In addition, where appropriate, we adjusted for differences in circumstances of sale (''COS'') for credit expenses, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C). We made COS adjustments by deducting from the starting price credit expenses. In addition, in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(A) and (B) of the Act, we deducted home market packing costs and added U.S. packing costs. We made adjustments, where appropriate, for physical differences in the merchandise in accordance with section 773(a)(6)(C)(ii) of the Act.

Currency Conversion

As in the preliminary determination, 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, ignoring fluctuations, in accordance with section 773A of the Act.

Section 773A of the Act directs the Department to use a daily exchange rate in order to convert foreign currencies into U.S. dollars unless the daily rate is a fluctuation. It is the Department's practice to find that a fluctuation exists when the daily exchange rate differs from the benchmark rate by 2.25 percent. The benchmark is defined as the moving average of rates for the past 40 business days. When we determine a fluctuation to have existed, we

substitute the benchmark for the daily rate.

Verification

As provided in section 782(i) of the Act, we verified the information submitted by the respondents for use in our final determination. We used standard verification procedures, including examination of relevant accounting and production records and original source documents provided by respondents. Our verification results are outlined in detail in the public versions and are on file in Room B–099, the Central Records Unit, of the Department of Commerce.

Analysis of Comments Received

We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. We received comments from the petitioner, and the two respondents, Bakrie and Swasthi. We also received rebuttal comments from the petitioner, Bakrie, Swasthi, and Globe.

Comment 1: Averaging Periods to Account for the Effect of Time on Price Comparability. Petitioner requests that the Department depart from its standard use of a single weighted-average price and use two six-month averaging periods to calculate the dumping margin in this investigation to ensure that the currency conversion methodology does not distort the Department's calculations of the dumping margins. Petitioner, in this case, cites the identical arguments for applying two six-month averaging periods discussed in the *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Preserved Mushrooms from Indonesia,* 63 FR 72268, 72272 (December 31, 1998) (''*Preserved Mushrooms*''). *See Preserved Mushrooms* at Comment 1.

According to Globe, the petitioner has misinterpreted the Department's decision regarding the application of two six-month averaging periods to calculate the dumping margin in this investigation. Globe argues that in the *Preserved Mushrooms* case, the Department chose not to use shorter averaging periods because they were of no consequence in that case. Accordingly, because the POI in this investigation is identical to the POI in *Preserved Mushrooms,* Globe contends that the Department should also not alter the averaging period and continue to average prices over the entire POI.

Swasthi also disagrees with the Petitioner's assertion that the Department should use two-averaging periods. Swasthi argues that dividing the POI into two parts would require the use of two sets of costs and sales data for each of the periods. Swasthi notes that the Department has only the costs and sales information regarding calendar year 1997, and does not have the information available to consider the Petitioner's proposed two-six month averaging period. On this basis, Swasthi contends that the Department should follow the practice as applied in *Preserved Mushrooms* by basing the price comparison on a single averaging period for all of calendar year 1997.

DOC Position. We agree with petitioners that separate averaging periods should be used. Under section 777A(d)(1)(A) of the Act , the Department has wide latitude in calculating the average prices used to determine whether sales at less than fair value exist. More specifically, under 19 C.F.R. 351.414(d)(3), the Department may use shorter averaging periods where normal value varies significantly over the POI. In this case, such a change is evidenced by the steady, significant decline in the rupiah's value that began about August 1997 and continued through the end of the POI. From August through December, the end of the POI, the rupiah's value decreased by more than 50 percent in relation to the dollar. Consequently, it is appropriate to use two averaging periods to avoid the possibility of a distortion in the dumping calculation. We disagree with Globe's claim that the use of averaging periods is not warranted because the POI is the same as the POI in *Preserved Mushrooms.* Whereas we declined to use two averaging periods in that case because doing so would have had no effect, thus rendering the issue moot, in this case the use of two averaging periods would affect our determination. As noted above, in our view, using a single averaging period would result in a distortion of the dumping calculation. We also disagree with Swasthi's assertion that we would need additional information in order to use two averaging periods. In accordance with our normal requirements, respondents reported individual sales transactions, and we simply segregated sales by period. Further, no additional or different cost information is required. The use of two averaging periods for margin calculation purposes does not affect whether the reported cost data are appropriate.

Comment 2: Calculated Profit. Petitioner argues that, should the Department find in its COP analysis that respondents made no sales above the cost of production, the Department should resort to the use of constructed value as NV, and apply, as the profit rate, a rate of 22.69 percent as used in the *Notice of Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Melamine Institutional Dinnerware Products From Indonesia,* 62 FR 1719, (January 13, 1997) (''*Melamine Dinnerware*'').

Swasthi argues that its home market sales are profitable, and therefore the Department should use, if necessary, Swasthi's actual profit rate and not the rate of a plastic tableware manufacturer. Swasthi continues to state that a profit rate of another industry is irrelevant for an analysis involving the extruded rubber thread industry.

Bakrie did not comment on this issue.

DOC Position. We disagree with Petitioner. According to section 773(e)(2)(B) of the Act, the Department has various methodologies for calculating profit where profit does not exist. The Statement of Administrative Action accompanying the URAA, H.R. Doc. No. 316, 103d Cong., 2nd Sess. (1994) (SAA) at 841, states that if a company has no home market profit on sales of the foreign like product or has incurred losses in the home market, the Department is directed to find an alternative home market profit. The statute also infers that a positive profit amount must be included in the calculation of constructed value by mandating the use of profit from any sales above the costs of production (even one sale) and provides alternative methods for determining profit when no sales are found to be above the cost of production.

Because Bakrie had no above-cost home market sales and, hence, no actual company-specific profit data available for its home market sales of the foreign like product, we calculated profit in accordance with section 773(e)(2)(B) of the Act. Specifically, section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act permits the Department to use any other reasonable method to determine profit. We note that Bakrie's audited 1997 financial statement indicated no profit during the POI. However, because Swasthi is another producer/exporter of the subject merchandise in Indonesia and did report a profit for the POI, we are applying, as facts available, its profit rate under section 773(e)(2)(B)(iii) of the Act. Therefore, we do not need to resort to other alternatives for a surrogate profit ratio.

Comment 3: Treatment of Bakrie's Audited Financial Statement as Public. Petitioner contends that the Department should treat Bakrie's 1997 audited financial statement as public information, as opposed to business proprietary information, based on the fact that Bakrie had to report such information to the Indonesian government.

Bakrie did not comment on this issue.

DOC Position. We disagree with Petitioner. Pursuant to section 351.105 of the Department's regulations, the Secretary normally will consider as business proprietary, at the request of the submitter, specific business information the release of which to the public would cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the submitter. At the time of Bakrie's questionnaire submission, Bakrie requested that its financial statement be treated as proprietary. Bakrie's financial statement is not a public document. Petitioner's argument that the financial statement should be a public document because Bakrie has acknowledged that it must provide a copy of its financial statement to the government of Indonesia is not pertinent to Bakrie's request for proprietary treatment of the document. The fact that Bakrie's financial statement might be disclosed to a government entity does not in and of itself demonstrate that such information is public. For example, companies must file a tax return with the government, but this fact does not mean that company tax returns are public documents. Therefore, we continue to treat Bakrie's financial statement as a business proprietary document.

Comment 4: Use of Facts Available in Swasthi's Sales Responses. Petitioner argues that, at the beginning of the verification process, Swasthi provided updated information regarding returns, discounts, commissions, payment dates, packing expenses, product codes, sales dates and inland freight costs for both U.S. and Indonesian sales, which essentially constituted a new questionnaire response. Petitioner asserts that, because such data constitutes untimely new information which should have been provided in the questionnaire responses, the Department should disregard this new data and adjust Swasthi's sales data using facts available.

Swasthi states that the revisions should be included in the Department's final determination because the Department was able to reconcile the revisions during verification.

DOC Position. The revisions Swasthi provided to the Department at verification amount to corrections of certain errors Swasthi made in its questionnaire responses. The errors in question were neither significant nor pervasive. On the first day of verification, Swasthi presented a revised Section B and C database. The revisions were the direct result of errors discovered in the course of preparing for the Department's verification. Furthermore, the revised sales databases were reconciled and formed the basis of the Department's verification report. Because it is the Department's practice to accept minor corrections at verification, we have accepted these corrections for purposes of this final determination.

Comment 5: Conversion of Correct Units of Measure of Imputed Credit Cost in the United States. Swasthi alleges that its imputed credit cost for sales incurred in the United States at the preliminary determination was reported in U.S. dollars per kilogram instead of U.S. dollars per pound. Swasthi contends that this resulted in an overstatement of imputed credit cost to be deducted from the gross sales prices. Swasthi requests that the Department recalculate its imputed credit cost in the United States based on the fact that the Department verified that the imputed credit was reported in U.S. dollars per pound.

Petitioner did not comment on this issue.

DOC Position. In both the preliminary determination and in this final determination, we calculated imputed credit costs for Swasthi's U.S. sales based on a cost per-pound basis. This was done because the U.S. sales price is made on a per-pound basis. Therefore, the proper credit costs were used in both the preliminary and final determinations.

Comment 6: Loan from Shareholders. Petitioner argues that the Department should impute an interest expense on loans received from related parties and that this is consistent both with related party transaction provisions in the statute and with the Department's normal practice. Specifically, petitioner states that Swasthi received loans from shareholders bearing a non-arm's length interest rate. Petitioner notes that it is the Department's practice to calculate the interest cost for loans from affiliated parties, *e.g.*, shareholders, based on the interest rate the loan recipient is paying unaffiliated parties. *See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Industrial Phosphoric Acid from Belgium*, 63 FR 55087, 55089, (October 18, 1998). According to petitioner, the COP the Department uses in its margin calculations should reflect the fair market cost of this type of loan.

Swasthi refutes petitioner's allegations by stating that its shareholders do indeed charge market interest rates on the loans; and that the cost of such loans were included as reported costs in its COP and CV databases. Swasthi notes that the Department stated in its verification report that there were no discrepancies in Swasthi's COP and/or CV databases. Thus, Swasthi contends, petitioner's comment on this issue should be disregarded.

DOC Position. We agree with Petitioner. It is the Department's practice to include imputed interest expenses in the computation of CV and COP on loans received from affiliated parties, if not included in the interest expense calculation. *See Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review: Shop Towels from Bangladesh*, 60 FR 48966, (September 21, 1995). The Department will normally impute an interest expense on transactions when the rate charged by a related party lender does not reflect a fair market rate. In this case, we do not consider the respondent's shareholder loans to be reflective of the fair market borrowing rate since such loans typically involve some cost to the borrower. The Department determined that Swasthi received loans from its shareholders, but the interest on those loans was not included in the calculation of Swasthi's COP and CV. Therefore, we calculated an annual imputed interest expense for the loan by multiplying the outstanding loan balance by the annual borrowing rate in rupiah as shown in the 1997 audited financial statement. The resulting per annum, annual imputed interest expense of the loan was added to Swasthi's reported interest expense, and the revised interest expense was then divided by the cost of goods sold to obtain a revised interest expense ratio which was used in the calculation of the COP (*see*, the Calculation Memorandum to the File dated March 18, 1999).

Comment 7: Imputed Credit and Inventory Carrying Costs. Bakrie argues that its U.S. and home market prices should not be adjusted for imputed credit costs and inventory carrying costs incurred in the home and United States because imputed credit costs are included in its interest expense for purposes of its COP calculation. Thus, Bakrie contends that the Department double-counted its interest expense because these expenses are included in COP and are also deducted from the home market sales price.

DOC Position. We did not double-count Bakrie's expenses. When conducting the COP test for Bakrie's home market sales, the COP includes the company's actual financial expenses. In conducting the COP test, we do not deduct imputed inventory carrying costs and home market credit costs from HM prices because the COP already includes the company's actual financial expenses. Thus, there is no double-counting of Bakrie's interest expenses. We do not perform the cost

test for U.S. sales. Therefore Bakrie's comment with respected to U.S. costs is moot.

Comment 8: Exclusion of Globe's Assistance in Bakrie's Reported COP. Petitioner contends that the Department should adjust Bakrie's reported COP to account for Globe's contribution to the joint venture which Petitioner asserts was not reflected in Bakrie's reported COP.

DOC Position. We disagree with Petitioner. Globe's contribution to the joint venture was already included in Bakrie's reported COP and CV databases. For further discussion, *see* the Calculation Memorandum to the File dated, March 18, 1999.

Continuation of Suspension of Liquidation

In accordance with section 735(c)(1)(B) of the Act, we are directing the Customs Service to begin suspension of liquidation for Swasthi of all entries of subject merchandise that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final determination in the **Federal Register**. We are also directing the Customs Service to continue to suspend liquidation for Bakrie of all entries of subject merchandise from Indonesia, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after November 3, 1998 (the date of publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**). The ''All Others'' rate applies to all exporters of extruded rubber thread not specifically listed below. The Customs Service shall continue to require a cash deposit or posting of a bond equal to the estimated amount by which the normal value exceeds the U.S. price as shown below. 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
P.T. Bakrie Rubber Industry	28.29
P.T. Swasthi Parama Mulya	44.86
All Others	31.54

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 735(d) of the Act, we have notified the International Trade Commission (ITC) of our determination. As our final determination is affirmative, the ITC will, within 45 days, determine whether these imports are materially injuring, or threaten material injury to, the U.S. industry. If the ITC determines that material injury, or threat of material injury does not exist, the proceeding will be terminated and all securities posted will be refunded or canceled. If the ITC determines that such injury does exist, the Department will issue an antidumping duty order directing Customs officials to assess antidumping duties on all imports of the subject merchandise entered for consumption on or after the effective date of the suspension of liquidation.

Return or Destruction of Proprietary Information

This notice serves as the only reminder to parties subject to Administrative Protective Order (''APO'') of their responsibility concerning the return or destruction of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 355.34(d). Failure to comply is a violation of the APO.

This determination is issued and published in accordance with sections 735(d) and 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: March 18, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–7371 Filed 3–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–301–602]

Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Colombia: Extension of Time Limit of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is extending the time limit for the final results in the 11th administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia. The period of review is March 1, 1997, through February 28, 1998. This extension is made pursuant to section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Rosa Jeong or Marian Wells, Import Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–3853 or 482–6309, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Department of Commerce (the Department) initiated the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on certain fresh cut flowers from Colombia on April 21, 1998 (63 FR 19709). On December 7, 1998, we extended the deadline for these preliminary results until February 10, 1999 (63 FR 6754). On February 18, 1999, we published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of this administrative review (64 FR 8059).

Due to the complexity of the issues present in this case, the Department has determined that it is not practicable to complete this review within the original time limit set forth in section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (the Act), as amended by the Uruguay Round Agreements Act. Therefore, the Department is extending the time limit for completion of the final results until August 17, 1999.

As a result of the extension of the final results, the Department is also postponing the briefing schedule. Case briefs will be due on June 3, 1999, rebuttal briefs will be due on June 10, 1999.

This extension is in accordance with the section 751(a)(3)(A) of the Act.

Dated: March 19, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary, Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–7368 Filed 3–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[C–560–804]

Final Negative Countervailing Duty Determination: Extruded Rubber Thread From Indonesia

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

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Robert Copyak or Eric B. Greynolds, Office of CVD/AD Enforcement VI, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: (202) 482–2786.

FINAL DETERMINATION: The Department of Commerce (the ''Department'') determines that countervailable subsidies are not being provided to producers or exporters of extruded rubber thread (ERT) in Indonesia.