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Service to begin suspension of liquidation for Swasthi of all entries of subject merchandise that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the date of publication of the final determination in the **Federal Register**.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continue to suspend liquidation for Bakrie of all entries of subject merchandise from Indonesia, that are entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after November 3, 1998 (the date of publication of the preliminary determination in the **Federal Register**).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.

Case History

Since the publication of the preliminary negative determination in the **Federal Register** on September 9, 1998, (63 FR 48191) (*Preliminary Determination*), the following events have occurred. Between September 23 and October 2, 1998, we conducted verification of the responses of the Government of Indonesia (GOI) and the respondent companies, P.T. Swasthi Parama Mulya (Swasthi) and Bakrie Rubber Industries (Bakrie). Swasthi submitted a case brief on December 1, 1998. No other parties to this investigation filed case briefs or rebuttal briefs. A public hearing was not requested by any interested party.

Scope of Investigation

For purposes of this investigation, the product covered is extruded rubber thread (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.

The 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 effective January 1, 1995 (the Act). In addition, unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the Department's regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR 351 and published in the **Federal Register** on May 19, 1997 (62 FR 27295).

Petitioner

The petition in this investigation was filed by North American Rubber Thread Co., Ltd. (the petitioner).

Period of Investigation

The period for which we are measuring subsidies (the ''POI'') is calendar year 1997.

De Minimis Countervailable Subsidy

Pursuant to its authority under section 771(36) of the Act, the United States Trade Representative (''USTR'') has designated Indonesia as a ''least developed country.'' *See* USTR Interim Final Rule: Developing and Least-Developed Country Designations Under the Countervailing Duty Law 15 CFR 2013 (63 FR 29945). Consequently, a net countervailable subsidy rate that does not exceed three percent *ad valorem* is considered *de minimis*, in accordance with section 703(b)(4)(B) of the Act, which implements Article 27 of the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (''SCM Agreement''). As discussed below, we determine that the net countervailable subsidy bestowed on extruded rubber thread from Indonesia is less than three percent *ad valorem*, and therefore, *de minimis*.

Analysis of Programs

Based upon our analysis of the petition, the responses to our questionnaires, the information reviewed at verification, and written briefs submitted by interested parties, we determine the following:

I. Programs Determined to Be Countervailable

A. Bank of Indonesia (BI) Rediscounted Loans

Under Decree No. 132/MPP/Kep/1996 of June 4, 1996, the Ministry of Industry and Trade, the Ministry of Finance, and the Bank of Indonesia (BI) provide support for certain exporters with the goal of achieving diversification of the Indonesian export base from oil and gas. Under the program, companies can sell their letters of credit and export drafts at a discount to the BI through participating foreign exchange banks, which are commercial banks that have obtained a license to conduct activities in foreign currencies. In the *Preliminary Determination*, we determined that this program was countervailable because the sale of the letters of credit and export drafts provided exporters with working capital at lower interest rates than they would otherwise obtain on the market. Our review of the information on the record, our findings at verification, and our analysis of the case brief submitted by Swasthi (*see* Comment 1) has not led us to change our preliminary determination that this program is countervailable.

During the POI, Swasthi obtained rediscounted loans under the BI rediscount loan program, as well as commercial rediscounted loans that were not associated with the BI rediscount loan program. Because Swasthi is a Designated Export Company (PET), it was eligible to obtain BI rediscounted loans at a rate that was lower than the rate available to non-PET companies, specifically, at the Singapore Interbank Offering Rate (SIBOR) rather than SIBOR plus one percentage point.

For purposes of the *Preliminary Determination*, we calculated the benefit to Swasthi under this program as the difference in the interest that Swasthi would have paid at the non-PET rate and interest it paid at the PET rate. However, for purposes of this final determination, we are using a different benchmark. According to section 771(5)(E)(ii) of the Act, the benefit conferred under a loan program is the difference between the amount the recipient of the loan pays on the loan under the government program and the amount the recipient would pay on a comparable commercial loan that it could actually obtain on the market. We verified that, during the POI, Swasthi obtained comparable commercial rediscounted loans outside of the BI rediscount loan program. Thus, we determine that those company-specific loans provide a more appropriate benchmark than the benchmark used in the *Preliminary Determination*. Therefore, instead of the using a rate established by the BI, we calculated the benchmark as the weighted-average interest rate of the non-BI rediscounted loans Swasthi obtained during the POI. In order to calculate the benefit under the program, we calculated the difference in the amount of interest Swasthi actually paid on the BI rediscounted loans during the POI and the amount it would have paid at the benchmark interest rate. We then divided the calculated benefit provided from the BI rediscount loan program by Swasthi's total exports of subject merchandise to the United States during the POI. We used export of subject merchandise to the United States because the loans could be segregated by product and destination. On this basis, we determine the benefit to Swasthi under this program to be 0.18 percent *ad valorem* for Swasthi. No other producers/exporters of the subject merchandise applied for or received loan under this program during the POI.

II. Programs Determined To Be Not Used

Based on the information provided in the responses and the results of verification, we determine that, during the POI, the producers/exporters of subject merchandise did not apply for or receive benefits under the following programs:

A. *Investment Credit for the Expansion of the Rubber Industry.*

B. *Corporate Income Tax Holiday.*

C. *Import Duty Exemption of Capital Equipment.*

Interest Party Comment

Comment 1: Benchmark Used in the Calculation of the Bank of Indonesia (BI) Rediscount Loan Program: Swasthi states that the Department should continue to use the benchmark interest rate employed in the *Preliminary Determination*, (*i.e.*, the interest rate differential between the BI's PET rate and the non-PET rate). Swasthi further argues that, when calculating the benefit provided by BI rediscounted loans, the Department should take into consideration the opportunity costs that Swasthi incurred as a result of collateral deposits. Swasthi states that collateral deposits are a typical banking practice in Indonesia.

Department's Position: We disagree with Swasthi's argument that the Department should continue to calculate the benefit to Swasthi using the BI rate for non-PET companies for comparison purposes. As explained above, section 771(5)(E)(ii) of the Act states that the benefit from a government loan program should be based upon comparable commercial loans that the company could actually obtain on the market. During the POI, Swasthi obtained comparable commercial rediscounted loans which are not associated with the BI rediscount loan program. Therefore, these loans are a more appropriate basis for benchmark purposes than the BI rediscount rate for non-PET companies.

Also we disagree that we should factor into our benefit calculations opportunity costs associated with collateral deposits. In determining whether particular loans are comparable for benchmark purposes, the Department normally focuses on the structure of the loans, the maturities of the loans, and the currencies in which the loans are denominated. As explained above, we have determined that Swasthi's commercial rediscounted loans are appropriate for benchmark purposes. They have comparable structures and maturities and are denominated in dollars.

As Swasthi acknowledges, collateral requirements are a typical bank practice in Indonesia. Both banks that participate in the BI rediscount loan program and banks that do not participate in the BI rediscount loan program require collateral. Moreover, collateral requirements vary across banks and loan types. Based on these facts, there is no basis for factoring in collateral requirements in determining the effective interest rates, nor is there a basis for finding that Swasthi's commercial rediscounted loans are not an appropriate benchmark.

Verification

In accordance with section 782(i) of the Act, we verified the information used in making our final determination. We followed our standard verification procedures, including meeting with government and company officials, and examining relevant accounting records and original source documents. Our verification results are outlined in detail in the public versions of the verification reports, which are on file in the Central Records Unit (Room B–099 of the Main Commerce Building).

Summary

In accordance with section 705(a)(3) of the Act, we determine that the total net countervailable subsidy rate for Bakrie is zero and that the total net countervailable subsidy rate for Swasthi is 0.18 percent *ad valorem*, which is *de minimis*. Therefore, we determine that no countervailable subsidies are being provided to the production or exportation of extruded rubber thread from Indonesia. Pursuant to section 705(c)(2) of the Act, this investigation will be terminated upon the publication of the final negative determination in the **Federal Register**.

ITC Notification

In accordance with section 705(d) of the Act, we will notify the ITC of our determination.

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 published pursuant to section 705(d) of the Act.

Dated: March 18, 1999.

Robert S. LaRussa,

Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–7372 Filed 3–25–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

Procedures for Delivery of HEU Natural Uranium Component in the United States

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

ACTION: Notice of draft revision of the procedures for delivery of HEU natural uranium component in the United States, and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The Department of Commerce is announcing draft revised procedures for the delivery of HEU material pursuant to the USEC Privatization Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE: March 26, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: James C. Doyle, Karla Whalen, or Juanita H. Chen, Enforcement Group III, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone: 202–482–3793.

Background

On April 25, 1996 Congress passed the United States Enrichment Corporation Privatization Act (''USEC Privatization Act''), 42 U.S.C. 2297h, *et seq*. The USEC Privatization Act requires the U.S. Department of Commerce (''Department'') to administer and enforce the limitations set forth in 42 U.S.C. 2297h–10(b)(5) of the USEC Privatization Act. On January 7, 1998, in order to implement this statutory mandate, the Department issued the Procedures for Delivery of HEU Natural Uranium Component in the United States. The purpose of issuing Procedures for Delivery of HEU Natural Uranium Component in the United States (''HEU Procedures'') is to enhance the predictability and transparency of the administration and enforcement of the above-referenced delivery limitations.

On July 6, 1998 the Department provided public notification of the HEU Procedures and Annex 1 to the HEU Procedures (see 63 FR 36391 (July 6, 1998)). On July 23, 1998 the Department issued a proposed Annex 2 to the HEU Procedures regarding re-importation requirements and requested public comment on Annex 2. Comments were received from eight parties.

In accordance with Section F of the HEU Procedures, on October 8, 1998, the Department requested comments on necessary or desirable changes to the HEU Procedures from parties (see 63 FR 54108 (October 8, 1998)). The Department received comments from eight parties regarding the HEU Procedures. After careful review of the comments, and after consultations with various parties, the Department has determined that revision and clarification of the HEU Procedures are warranted. Revised HEU Procedures are set forth below.

The Department hereby invites parties to provide comment on these draft