J.Bracic
& ASSOCIATES

TRADE REMEDY ADVISORS
PO BOX 3749, MANUKA ACT 2603
+61 (0)499 056 729
john@jbracic.com.au

PUBLIC RECORD

15 September 2026

The Director – Investigations 3
Anti-Dumping Commission
GPO Box 2013
Canberra ACT 2601
By email: investigations3@adcommission.gov.au

Accelerated Review No 708 – Steel reinforcing bar exported from the Republic of Indonesia

Dear Director,

We act for PT The Master Steel Manufactory (Master Steel), the applicant for this accelerated review. This submission responds to the submission lodged by InfraBuild (Newcastle) Pty Ltd (InfraBuild) on 9 September 2026 concerning steel grade selection and specification adjustments.

InfraBuild submits that "[t]he Anti-dumping Commission has an obligation to set a floor price for this 'new' exporter that will be effective to prevent future dumping into Australia capable of causing material injury to the Australian industry". It says that "[g]iven the requirements of the Australian market, it is reasonable to expect that any future exports by Master Steel would similarly comprise this grade", meaning AS/NZS 4671:2019 Grade 500N.

From that expectation InfraBuild draws two requests. The first is that "[t]he most appropriate Indonesian rebar grade for comparison to the future Australian export Grade 500N would be BjTS 520". The second is that "[i]f Indonesian sales of this grade are minimal, a specification adjustment to sales of Grade BjTS 420 may need to be applied", on the basis that "[i]t is InfraBuild's expectation that the higher strength offered by Grade BjTS 520 would reflect a higher price when compared to sales of the lower strength Grade BjTS 420".

InfraBuild also asks the Commission to review Master Steel's domestic sales "where grade is the only difference, at a particular point in time, preferably to the same customer in the same location, in order to understand whether any price premium applies based on Grade only", and to disclose in its final report "their consideration of domestic and future export grades and the nature of any specification adjustments made".

Master Steel's information

Master Steel's exporter questionnaire response lists, at C-2, the model control codes of every like good it sold on the domestic market in the review period. Under the model control code structure for this review, the second element records the minimum yield strength specified by the product standard, with sub-category "C" covering "Greater than 480 but less than 550" MPa. The listed codes include sub-category "C" codes as well as sub-category "B" and "D" codes.

Master Steel's domestic sales therefore include the sub-category InfraBuild identifies as the correct comparator. The Commission confirmed in Investigation No 655 that "500N and BjTS 520 rebar grades would fall within the same MCC sub-category C by having a minimum yield strength of 'Greater than 480 but less than 550 MPa'".

Commission’s practice

In Reviews 409 and 410, Baosteel and Meisteel sought a floor price founded on specific domestic models, claiming "that they intend to export these 'non-standard' products to Australia in the future". The Commission observed that "[n]either Baosteel nor Meisteel have provided any evidence to support this claim", and that "[w]hen proposing a form of measures, the Commission does not base its consideration on particular product characteristics or specifications and does not impose different forms of measures on goods that may have certain product characteristics and specifications, as requested by the applicants".[1] InfraBuild asks for a floor set by reference to the grade it expects Master Steel to export. Baosteel and Meisteel asked for a floor set by reference to the goods they said they would export, and were refused.

Report No 359 concerned an accelerated review of an exporter with no exports to Australia, as here. OneSteel submitted that "[t]he domestic grades most alike to the intended exported grade AS/NZ3679.1 are JIS G3106 SM490 and JIS G3116 SN490".[2] The Commission rejected the approach in terms that apply directly to Master Steel:

> *In the absence of export sales to Australia and domestic sales of like goods manufactured to the AS/NZ3679.1 standard in the review period by DSC, or a contract for supply, it is not possible for the Commission to reasonably anticipate the product mix that might be exported to Australia by DSC, and therefore it is not possible restrict the number of models used in the assessment of normal value for the purpose of undertaking a fair comparison in the manner suggested by OneSteel.*[3]

InfraBuild put the same proposition in the recent China rebar inquiry. The Commission recorded that "InfraBuild submitted that Grade 500N is the commonly sold grade in Australia", and responded that "in the context of the MCC category relating to yield strength, the Australian standard, AS/NZS 4671:2019, specifies steel strength grades of minimum yield strengths of 250 MPa, 300 MPa, and 500 MPa".[4] In the companion review of Baowu Group Echeng, which had not exported, the Commission stated that "[c]onsistent with the commission's practices, domestic sales of all models of like goods sold in OCOT were used in determining this profit".[5]

---

[1] Reports Nos 409 and 410, Aluminium Zinc Coated Steel from China, section 6.3.1, pp 39–40.
[2] Report No 359, Certain Hot Rolled Structural Steel Sections from Taiwan, section 3.3.2, p.9.
[3] REP 359, §3.3.2, p 10.
[4] Report No 669, Steel Reinforcing Bar from China, section 7.3.1, p.66.
[5] Report No 676, Steel Reinforcing Bar from China, p.28.

In Report No 250 the Commission set normal value "at the weighted average normal value based on all like goods sold by Calispa in the review period".[6] Other accelerated reviews of exporters that followed the same approach include report No 359, which used all like goods, and in Report No 514 profit was worked out "based on all like goods sold domestically by Foshan Minghua".[7]

Consistent approach required

The Dumping and Subsidy Manual states that it "seeks to promote a consistent approach to investigation findings and decisions", and "provides interested members of the community with an explanation of the guidelines used by the Commission in conducting investigations". On adjustments, it states that "[t]he Commission seeks relevant data and makes adjustments where evidence exists that a particular difference has affected price comparability", and that "[w]here based on costs, it is subject to the principle that adjustments will be made only where evidence indicates that price comparability has been affected". InfraBuild quotes those passages. They state one standard, and it applies whichever party seeks the adjustment.

The Review Panel has recognised the value of consistency. It has accepted "the reliance that interested parties place on the policy and practice explained in the Manual".[8] It has endorsed the Commission's "standard practice", which "provides optimal procedural fairness, certainty of process and transparency for all interested parties, unless the circumstances are so exceptional as to warrant a deviation from the standard practice".[9] It has said that alignment with earlier findings "will provide continuing certainty to interested parties",[10] and that it "would have expected the ADC to provide some justification for making the adjustment, in accordance with its usual policy and practice".[11]

No exceptional circumstance is suggested here. InfraBuild's concern is that a floor price will "remain in place until the next opportunity for variable factors to be reviewed". That is true of every floor price set in every accelerated review, and it is the reason the method used to set the floor should be the Commission's settled method rather than one adapted to this specific case.

The purpose of the procedure is to allow an exporter that has not been examined to have its own variable factors ascertained before it begins to sell. Master Steel did not export the goods during the investigation period for Investigation No 418, and it had no export sales of rebar in the review period. It has not been found to have dumped. An exporter in that position can only decide whether to enter the Australian market if it can know in advance the rules by which its floor price will be set. If the evidentiary standard the Commission applies to an exporter's request for a grade adjustment is relaxed when the Australian industry makes the same request, the accelerated review ceases to perform that function. It becomes an obstacle to entry for the exporters it was created to serve.

---

[6] Report No 250, Prepared or Preserved Tomatoes Exported from Italy, section 4.2.2, p 11, and section 4.2.4, p.14.
[7] Report No 514, Aluminium extrusions from China, section 4.5.3, p.17.
[8] ADRP Report No 151, para 56, p.24.
[9] ADRP Report No 168, para 191, pp 89–90.
[10] ADRP Report No 143, para 43, p.12.
[11] ADRP Report No 126, para 186, p.75.

The Commission is therefore requested to proceed on the evidentiary standard it has applied to exporters and to the Australian industry alike. The normal value should be ascertained from Master Steel's domestic sales of like goods, compared through the model control code structure the Commission set for this review.

Yours faithfully,

John Bracic