fails to apply the correct rate as of that date. Niagara argues that the Department's determination to apply Glynwed's antidumping duty deposit rate to Niagara prospectively from the publication date of the final results, is contrary to the Department's finding that Niagara is the successor-in-interest to Glynwed as of May 21, 1999, and inconsistent with the retroactive application of Glynwed's countervailing duty deposit rate to Niagara. Niagara states that this failure to retroactively apply Glynwed's antidumping deposit rate of 7.69 percent to Niagara unjustly subjects it to the higher all-others rate of 25.82 percent for the entire period from May 21, 1999, to the date on which the final results in this case are published.

Finally, Niagara asserts that it has no practical means of obtaining a refund of the higher deposits, since the costs of undertaking an administrative review would exceed the value of the excess deposits it was erroneously required to pay.

Department's Position

We disagree with Niagara that it has been treated inconsistently with respect to the applicable cash deposit rates under the antidumping and countervailing duty orders. The basis for Niagara's apparent misunderstanding is that it fails to recognize that Glenwyd, the predecessor company to Niagara, was excluded, *ab initio,* from the countervailing duty order, but has always been subject to the antidumping duty order. As such, Glenwyd, and now its successor-in-interest Niagara, was never liable for any estimated cash deposits under the countervailing duty order. Thus, with the Department's determination that Niagara is the successor-in-interest to Glenwyd, Niagara (like Glenwyd) is not now, and never was subject to the countervailing duty order. Therefore, with respect to the countervailing duty order, it is appropriate to apply the changed circumstances-determination retroactively to May 21, 1999, the date Glenwyd became Niagara. (This is analogous to revocation, which may also apply retroactively. *See, e.g., Certain Fresh Cut Flowers From Ecuador: Final Results of Changed Circumstances Antidumping Duty Administrative Review; Revocation of Order; Termination of Administrative Reviews,* 64 FR 56327, Oct. 9, 1999.)

However, with respect to the antidumping duty order, it is appropriate to change the estimated cash deposit rate for Niagara only as of the effective date of the Department's final changed-circumstances determination. Because Glenwyd was always subject to the antidumping duty order, it was always potentially liable for estimated cash deposits. Further, any new company under the antidumping duty order in question, even if it were subsequently determined to be the successor-in-interest to an existing company, would also be subject to estimated cash deposits.

In this instance, subject merchandise was entered under the name of Niagara, a company not heretofore assigned its own rate. Accordingly, its entries were properly subject to the all-others cash deposit rate at the time of entry. The all-others rate is by its very nature a prospective rate in that it is simply an estimate of the amount of duties to be paid by importers on future entries. It is not the assessment rate. Furthermore, in accordance with section 751(a)(2)(C) of the Act, a company's estimated cash deposit rate is only changed as the result of an administrative review. Thus, until the Department makes a final determination that a company subject to this antidumping duty order should be assigned a different cash deposit rate, the cash deposit rate assigned to its entries is the rate in effect at the time of entry.

Accordingly, in this instance, it is appropriate that the applicable cash deposit rate for Niagara's entries prior to these final results is the all-others cash deposit rate. That rate will, of course, be changed prospectively to Glenwyd's previous rate upon the effective date of this notice because the Department has determined that Niagara is, in fact, the successor-in-interest to Glenwyd. However, because cash deposits are only estimates of the amount of antidumping duties that will be due, changes in cash deposit rates are not made retroactive. Any given cash deposit rate may, ultimately, be too high or too low. If Niagara believes that the deposits paid exceed the actual amount of dumping, it is entitled to request a review of those entries to determine the proper assessment rate and receive a refund of any excess deposits. This is the normal operation of our retrospective system.

Final Results

We determine that Niagara is the successor-in-interest to Glynwed for purposes of determining antidumping and countervailing duty liability. Because Glynwed is excluded from the countervailing duty order, we will instruct the Customs Service to liquidate, without regard to countervailing duties, all shipments of the subject merchandise produced and sold by Niagara (formerly Glynwed) entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after May 21, 1999, the date of Niagara's acquisition of Glynwed. With regard to antidumping duties, a cash deposit rate of 7.69 percent will be effective for Niagara (formerly Glynwed) for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of these final results of this changed-circumstances review.

We are issuing and publishing this determination and notice in accordance with sections 751(b)(1) and 777(i)(1) of the Act and section 351.216 of the Department's regulations.

Dated: November 19, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–31098 Filed 11–29–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

A–427–098

Anhydrous Sodium Metasilicate From France: Notice of Final Results of the Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On August 23, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of its administrative review of the antidumping duty order on anhydrous sodium metasilicate from France for the period January 1, 1998, through December 31, 1998. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results of review but received no comments. Therefore, these final results of review have not changed from those presented in the preliminary results of review, in which we applied total adverse facts available.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 30, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stacey King or Richard Rimlinger, Office of Antidumping/Countervailing Duty Enforcement, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20230; telephone (202) 482–1757/4477.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

The Applicable Statute and Regulations

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's (the Department's) regulations are to the regulations codified at 19 CFR Part 351 (1998).

Background

On August 23, 1999, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (64 FR 45949) the preliminary results of the review of this order. We gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on our preliminary results. We received no comments. In the preliminary results, we determined the weighted-average dumping margin for the period January 1, 1998, through December 31, 1998, to be 60.0 percent. The Department has now completed the administrative review in accordance with section 751 of the Act.

Scope of Review

Imports covered by the review are shipments of ASM, a crystallized silicate which is alkaline and readily soluble in water. Applications include waste paper de-inking, ore-flotation, bleach stabilization, clay processing, medium or heavy duty cleaning, and compounding into other detergent formulations. This merchandise is classified under Harmonized Tariff Schedules (HTS) item numbers 2839.11.00 and 2839.19.00. The HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

Final Results of the Review

Because we received no comments from interested parties, we have determined that no changes to the preliminary results are warranted for purposes of these final results. The weighted-average dumping margin for the period January 1, 1998, through December 31, 1998, is as follows:

Company	Margin (percent)
Rhone-Poulenc, S.A	60.0

The Department will issue appraisement instructions for Rhone-Poulenc merchandise directly to the Customs Service.

Furthermore, the following deposit rates will be effective upon publication of these final results for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Act: (1) The cash deposit rate for Rhone-Poulenc, S.A., will be the rate listed above; (2) for previously reviewed or investigated companies not listed above, the cash deposit rate will continue to be the company-specific rate published for the most recent period; (3) if the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, a prior review, or the original LTFV investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (4) for all other producers and/or exporters of this merchandise, the cash deposit rate shall be 60.0 percent, the ''all others'' rate established in the LTFV investigation (45 FR 77498, November 24, 1980). This deposit rate, when imposed, shall remain in effect until publication of the final results of the next administrative review.

This notice also serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 351.402(f)(2) to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This notice also serves as the only reminder to parties subject to administrative protective order (APO) of their responsibility concerning the disposition of proprietary information disclosed under APO in accordance with 19 CFR 351.305(a)(3). Timely notification of return/destruction of APO materials or conversion to judicial protective order is hereby requested. Failure to comply with the regulations and the terms of an APO is a sanctionable violation.

We are issuing and publishing this determination in accordance with sections 751(a)(1) 777(i)(1) of the Act.

Dated: November 19, 1999.

Joseph A. Spetrini,

Acting Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.

[FR Doc. 99–31096 Filed 11–29–99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

International Trade Administration

[A–583–826]

Collated Roofing Nails From Taiwan: Final Results of Antidumping Administrative Review

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

ACTION: Notice of final results of antidumping duty administrative review.

SUMMARY: On August 10, 1999, the Department of Commerce published the preliminary results of the administrative review of the antidumping duty order on collated roofing nails from Taiwan (64 FR 4334). This review covers Dinsen Fastening System, Inc, a manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States, and the period November 20, 1997, through October 31, 1998. We conducted a verification of Dinsen Fastening System, Inc.'s antidumping duty questionnaire responses and gave interested parties an opportunity to comment on the preliminary results. No parties filed comments on the preliminary results. We have revised our margin calculation to correct an error in the verification report that was brought to our attention by the respondent on July 30, 1999. However, the correction did not change the final margin results from the preliminary margin results. The final results are listed below in the ''Final Results of Review'' section of this notice.

EFFECTIVE DATE: November 30, 1999.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mary Jenkins or Katherine Johnson, Office 2, AD/CVD Enforcement Group I, Import Administration, Room B099, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482–1756, or 482–4929, respectively.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

On August 10, 1999, the Department of Commerce (''the Department'') published in the **Federal Register** the preliminary results of the 1997–1998 administrative review of the antidumping duty order on collated roofing nails from Taiwan (64 FR 43344) (*Preliminary Results*). We conducted verification of Dinsen Fastening System, Inc's, (''Dinsen'') antidumping duty questionnaire responses from June 1, 1999, through June 4, 1999, and issued