



Australian Government
**Department of Industry, Science,
Energy and Resources**

**Anti-Dumping
Commission**

CUSTOMS ACT 1901 - PART XVB

**Anti-Dumping Commission
Preliminary Report**

Reinvestigation of Certain Findings in Report No. 546

**Steel Reinforcing Bar exported to Australia from
the Republic of Korea, Singapore,
Spain (except Nervacero S.A.) and
Taiwan (except Power Steel Co., Ltd)**

14 May 2021

CONTENTS

CONTENTS.....2

ABBREVIATIONS.....3

1 SUMMARY.....4

1.1 INTRODUCTION4

1.2 REVIEWABLE DECISION4

1.3 APPROACH TO THE REINVESTIGATION5

1.4 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED6

1.5 PRELIMINARY FINDINGS6

1.6 SUBMISSIONS.....6

2 VARIABLE FACTORS – NORMAL VALUE8

2.1 KOREA.....8

2.1.1 Approach in Continuation 5468

2.1.2 InfraBuild grounds for review.....8

2.1.3 ADRP reinvestigation request10

2.1.4 Submissions10

2.1.5 Commission approach to reinvestigation11

2.2 KOREA - NORMAL VALUE AND DUMPING MARGIN FINDING11

2.2.1 Daehan.....11

2.2.2 Uncooperative and all other Korean exporters.....12

2.3 TAIWAN.....13

2.3.1 No request for reinvestigation for the ADRP13

2.3.2 InfraBuild submission13

2.3.3 Commission’s response14

3 LIKELIHOOD OF DUMPING AND INJURY CONTINUATION OR RECURRING15

3.1 ADRP REINVESTIGATION REQUEST15

4 CONCLUSION16

4.1 PRELIMINARY REINVESTIGATION FINDING.....16

5 ATTACHMENTS.....17

PUBLIC RECORD

ABBREVIATIONS

the Act	<i>Customs Act 1901 (Cth)</i>
ADN	Anti-Dumping Notice
ADRP	Anti-Dumping Review Panel
ADRP Report No. 108	<i>ADRP Report No.108 – Certain findings in Reports 486 and 489 Steel Reinforcing Bar</i>
the Commission	the Anti-Dumping Commission
the Commissioner	the Commissioner of the Anti-Dumping Commission
Continuation 546	Continuation Inquiry 546 – Steel reinforcing bar exported to Australia from the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Spain (except Nervacero S.A.) and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co., Ltd)
Daehan	Daehan Steel Co., Ltd
EPR	electronic public record
FOB	Free on Board
the goods	steel reinforcing bar
InfraBuild	InfraBuild (Newcastle) Pty Ltd
inquiry period	the period from 1 January 2019 to 31 December 2019
Korea	the Republic of Korea
the Minister	the Minister for Industry, Science and Technology
rebar	steel reinforcing bar
REP 546	<i>Anti-Dumping Commission Report No. 546</i>
Review 486/489	Review of Anti-Dumping Measures 486/489 – Steel reinforcing bar exported to Australia from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co., Ltd)
Review 566	Review of Anti-Dumping Measures 566 – Steel reinforcing bar exported to Australia from the Republic of Korea and Spain (except Nervacero S.A.)

1 SUMMARY

1.1 Introduction

This report sets out the preliminary findings of the Commissioner of the Anti-Dumping Commission (the Commissioner) in respect of a reinvestigation conducted at the request of the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (ADRP) for ADRP Review No. 2020/130.

ADRP Review No. 2020/130 is a review of certain findings and recommendations arising from Continuation Inquiry 546 – Steel reinforcing bar exported to Australia from the Republic of Korea (Korea), Singapore, Spain (except Nervacero S.A.) and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co., Ltd) (Continuation 546). The findings and recommendations from Continuation 546 are set out in *Anti-Dumping Commission Report No. 546 (REP 546)*.¹

1.2 Reviewable decision

On 3 March 2020, the Commissioner initiated Continuation 546 into the continuation of the anti-dumping measures, in the form of a dumping duty notice, applying to steel reinforcing bar (rebar or ‘the goods’) exported to Australia from Korea, Singapore, Spain (except Nervacero S.A.) and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co., Ltd).²

On 6 November 2020, the Minister for Industry, Science and Technology (the Minister) accepted by signed notice published under section 269ZHG(1)(b) of the *Customs Act 1901* (Cth) (the Act), the recommendations set out in REP 546.³ In doing so, the Minister decided to secure the continuation of the anti-dumping measures and determined that the notice continue in force after 19 November 2020, but after that day, the notice:

- ceased to apply to exporters of rebar from Singapore and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co. Ltd); and
- had effect as if different specified variable factors had been fixed in relation to all exporters of rebar from Korea and Spain (except Nervacero S.A.).

The ADRP accepted applications for a review of the Minister’s decision from the following interested parties:

- Compañia Española de Laminación, S.L.⁴; and
- InfraBuild (Newcastle) Pty Ltd (InfraBuild)⁵,

and initiated its review of the decision by public notice on 16 December 2020.⁶

¹ Continuation 546 – Electronic Public Record (EPR 546), record no.37.

² Anti-Dumping Notice (ADN) No. 2020/020, EPR 546, record no. 2.

³ ADN No. 2020/111, EPR 546, record no. 38.

⁴ CELSA Application for Review. Published on ADRP website, 16 December 2020.

⁵ InfraBuild Application for Review. Published on ADRP website, 16 December 2020.

⁶ ADRP Review 130 – Anti-Dumping Review Panel, Public Notice under section 269ZZI. Published on ADRP website, 16 December 2020.

PUBLIC RECORD

On 17 February 2021, the ADRP requested that the Commissioner reinvestigate the following findings in REP 546, which concerned InfraBuild's grounds for review:

- the normal value for the Korean exporter, Daehan Steel Co., Ltd (Daehan);
- the normal value for uncooperative and other Korean exporters; and
- whether the expiration of the measures in respect of Daehan and uncooperative and other exporters from Korea would lead or likely to lead, to the material injury that the anti-dumping measure is intended to prevent.⁷

In Continuation 546, these normal values were determined under section 269TAC(6), having regard all relevant information. Specifically, the normal values ascertained in Review of Anti-Dumping Measures 486/489 – Steel reinforcing bar exported to Australia from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co., Ltd) (Review 486/489), with an adjustment. The adjustment was based on the movement in Daehan's ascertained export price between the period examined in Review 486/489 (1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018) and the inquiry period examined in Continuation 546 (1 January 2019 to 31 December 2019). In doing so, the Commission did not consider the selling price information in respect of rebar on the Korean market provided by InfraBuild in its application for Continuation 546

The ADRP has requested a reinvestigation of the normal values because it:

- considers the use of export price movements as a guide to changes in normal value was not wholly reliable, as a direct correlation between the two variables is not necessarily observed; and
- does not accept that the Commission was precluded from using the information provided by InfraBuild simply by reason that InfraBuild provided the information on a confidential basis or that the commercial provider had not consented to its use by the Commission.

The ADRP requested that the Commissioner report on the result of the reinvestigation by no later than 7 April 2021. At the Commissioner's request, the ADRP subsequently extended this deadline to **6 July 2021**.

1.3 Approach to the reinvestigation

The reinvestigation has been conducted in accordance with section 269ZZL(2). In conducting the reinvestigation, the Commissioner has had regard to:

- the grounds accepted for review as published by the ADRP under section 269ZZI;
- InfraBuild's application to the ADRP;
- the ADRP's reasons for requesting the reinvestigation;
- submissions received by the ADRP in relation to this review;
- submissions received by the Commission in relation to the review and reinvestigation request; and

⁷ Letters from the ADRP to the Commissioner published and the ADRP website on 17 February 2021 and 15 March 2021.

PUBLIC RECORD

- all relevant information available to the Commission in respect of Continuation 546.

1.4 Submissions received

On 26 February 2021, the Commission notified interested parties of its intention not to publish its preliminary findings of the reinvestigation on the public record as it considered the scope of the reinvestigation to be limited. The Commission invited interested parties to make a submission on matters concerning the reinvestigation by 12 March 2021.⁸

In reconsidering the issue of normal value in the reinvestigation, the Commission had provided revised normal value and dumping margin calculations to the relevant parties for comment.

The Commission received the following submissions in response to the reinvestigation:

- InfraBuild dated 2 March 2021;⁹ and
- Daehan dated 12 March 2021;¹⁰ and
- InfraBuild dated 12 March 2021.¹¹

The submissions raised matters that warranted further consideration by the Commission and the publication of a preliminary reinvestigation report (this report).

1.5 Preliminary findings

The Commission has found that:

- the normal values determined for Daehan and uncooperative and all other Korean exporters have changed;
- consequently, the dumping margins have changed as summarised in the table below:

Exporter	REP 546	ADRP Review No. 130 - Reinvestigation
Daehan	3.9%	2.3%
Uncooperative and all other exporters from Korea	4.0%	7.2%

Table 1- Dumping margin summary

- the changes to the normal values and the resultant dumping margins do not cause the Commissioner to reconsider his recommendation to secure the continuation of the measures applying to rebar exported to Australia by Daehan and uncooperative and all other Korean exporters.

⁸ Commission file note, EPR 546, record no. 39.

⁹ EPR 546, record no. 40.

¹⁰ EPR 546, record no. 41.

¹¹ EPR 546, record no. 42.

1.6 Submissions

The Commission invites interested parties to make submissions in response to the preliminary findings as set out in this report by no later than **28 May 2021**.

The Commission's preference is to receive submissions by email to investigations2@adcommission.gov.au. Submissions may also be addressed to:

The Director, Investigations 2
Anti-Dumping Commission
GPO Box 2013
Canberra ACT 2600

Interested parties claiming that information contained in their submissions is confidential, or that the publication of the information would adversely affect their business of commercial interests, must:

- provide a summary containing sufficient detail to allow a reasonable understanding of the substance of the information that does not breach that confidentiality or adversely affect those interests; or
- satisfy the Commissioner that there is no way such a summary can be given to allow a reasonable understanding of the substance of the information.

Submissions containing confidential information must be clearly marked "OFFICIAL: SENSITIVE". Interested parties must lodge a non-confidential version of their submission, clearly marked "PUBLIC RECORD".

2 VARIABLE FACTORS – NORMAL VALUE

2.1 Korea

2.1.1 Approach in Continuation 546

Daehan was the only cooperative exporter from Korea in Continuation 546.

The Commission was unable to assess the suitability of Daehan's domestic sales for the purposes of establishing the normal value under section 269TAC(1) having not been satisfied of the completeness, relevance and accuracy of the data relating to:

- a portion of Daehan's domestic sales; and
- Daehan's cost to make and sell the goods and like goods.

The Commission disregarded this information as it pertained to the determination of Daehan's normal value for the inquiry period, in accordance with section 269TAC(7).

The Commission determined the normal values for Daehan and uncooperative and all other Korean exporters, pursuant to section 269TAC(6), having regard to all relevant information. In REP 546, the Commission considered that the most reliable and contemporaneous information before it was the verified normal values last ascertained in respect of Daehan and other Korean exporters in Review 486/489.^{12,13}

An adjustment to the normal values ascertained in Review 486/489 was made based on what the Commission considered to be the most reliable information available to it at the time of REP 546, being the movement in Daehan's ascertained export price between the period examined in Review 486/489 (1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018) and the inquiry period examined in Continuation 546 (1 January 2019 to 31 December 2019).

2.1.2 InfraBuild grounds for review

Normal value determined for Daehan

InfraBuild set out in Ground One of its application for review to the ADRP, that the reviewable decision of the Minister was not correct or preferable in respect of Daehan because the use of export prices by the Commission for the purposes of a timing adjustment to the normal values ascertained in Review 486/489 was not '*relevant information*' within the meaning of section 269TAC(6). InfraBuild further submitted that:

- the extrapolation of changes in domestic selling prices on the basis of movements in export prices is not relevant to, or indicative of normal values. Movements in export prices and raw material inputs such as scrap steel are not necessarily comparable or in alignment with movements in domestic selling prices. The fact

¹² Findings and recommendations the result of Review 486/489 are set out in *Anti-Dumping Commission Report No. 486 and 489*. EPR 489, record no. 25.

¹³ In *ADRP Report No. 108 - Certain findings in Reports 486 and 489 Steel Reinforcing Bar* (ADRP Report No. 108), the ADRP determined that there was no error in the methodology applied by the Commission to ascertain the normal values for Daehan and therefore, the normal value remained the same as that in the reviewable decision.

PUBLIC RECORD

that the ascertained export price information was verified to the Commission's satisfaction did not justify its application;

- the Commissioner should have made a recommendation to the Minister with reference to available, published price surveys as the basis for an adjustment to relevant but historical normal value information;
- it had provided information of such a kind in support of its original application to Continuation 546. REP 546 stated that the Commission did not use this pricing information as the publisher of that information had not consented to its use, nor did the Commission have other information before it relevant to selling prices of rebar in the Korean market;
- the Commissioner relied on InfraBuild's published pricing information in respect of the Korean rebar market in its consideration of its application for Continuation 546 under section 269ZHD. It is in this context that InfraBuild considers it reasonable to conclude that *'the Commissioner did not consider himself precluded from considering the published pricing information for the purpose of deciding on the recommendations to be made to the Minister'* under section 269ZHF(3); and
- it was not advised that the Commission intended not to use the published pricing information in the application to Continuation 546, such that it could not provide supplementary data (which it attached to its application for an ADRP review) prior to the Commissioner giving the Minister the report under section 269ZHF.

InfraBuild submitted that the correct or preferable decision would be to ascertain the normal value for Daehan having regard to the normal values ascertained in Review 486/489, adjusted by the movement in published price information between the Review 486/489 and Continuation 546 periods, either by reference to information supplied in InfraBuild's original application or its application for ADRP review.¹⁴

Normal value determined for uncooperative and all other exporters from Korea

At Ground Three of InfraBuild's application for review to the ADRP, InfraBuild maintained that the reviewable decision of the Minister in REP 546 as it concerned uncooperative and all other Korean exporters was not correct or preferable as the normal value determined under section 269TAC(6) was by reference to the normal value specific to Daehan. InfraBuild submitted that to the extent that the normal value specific to Daehan determined in REP 546 is revoked and replaced, the same treatment should apply to uncooperative and all other Korean exporters.

For clarity, the Commission notes that in REP 546, the normal value for uncooperative and all other Korean exporters was not determined directly by reference to the normal value specific to Daehan. Rather, the normal value ascertained in REP 486/489 for uncooperative and all other cooperative exporters from Korea was adopted with an adjustment made for the movement in Daehan's export prices between the two periods. As the methodology for adjusting the normal value was the same as that of Daehan, the Commission considers that the arguments set by InfraBuild at Ground 1 apply to Ground 3 as was acknowledged by the ADRP in its reinvestigation request to the Commissioner (section 2.1.3 refers).

¹⁴ InfraBuild Application for Review. Published on ADRP website, 16 December 2020

2.1.3 ADRP reinvestigation request

The ADRP requested that the Commissioner reinvestigate the following findings in REP 546, which concerned InfraBuild's grounds for review:

- the normal value for the Korean exporter, Daehan; and
- the normal value for uncooperative and other Korean exporters.

In its reinvestigation request to the Commissioner, the ADRP stated that it was of the understanding that the commercial provider of the pricing information contained in InfraBuild's application to Continuation 546 previously declined to renew the Commission's subscription such that the Commission considered it was precluded from having regard to the Korean rebar pricing information.

The ADRP observed that section 269ZHG(3) provides that in deciding on the recommendations to be made to the Minister in the Commissioner's report, the Commissioner must have regard to the application for continuation of the anti-dumping measures. The ADRP further noted that:

- REP 546 explicitly stated the price information in InfraBuild's application was not used;
- it was of the view that the pricing information was relevant to the issue of normal value under section 269TAC(6);
- notwithstanding that the pricing information was provided to InfraBuild, and by InfraBuild to the Commission on a confidential basis, it was of the opinion that any breach of confidence or copyright did not qualify the Commissioner's obligation to have regard to materials in the application.

For these reasons, the ADRP was of the opinion that regard should have been had to the pricing information contained in the continuation application insofar as it related to Korea.

In respect of the supplementary information on movements in the domestic prices of rebar in Korea, the ADRP considered that while this was not before the Commission during the conduct of Continuation 546 and it was unclear whether it was '*relevant information*' with which the ADRP could have substantive regard to under section 269ZZK(6)(d), the Commissioner is not confined to '*relevant information*' within section 269ZZK(6) in the conduct of a reinvestigation.

2.1.4 Submissions

In its submission to the Commission of 2 March 2021, InfraBuild¹⁵ reiterated the ADRP's comments concerning:

- the relevance of published price surveys on the Korean rebar market in the determination of normal values rather than export prices; and
- scope for the Commissioner to now have regard to supplementary pricing information provided in its application for an ADRP review, as he is not limited to '*relevant information*' under 269ZZK(6) in a reinvestigation.

¹⁵ EPR 546, record no.40.

PUBLIC RECORD

In its submission of 12 March 2020¹⁶ Daehan submitted that:

- in Continuation 546, the Commission was under an obligation to closely examine information from secondary sources and disregard such information if it could not be shown to be reliable;
- an evaluative and comparative assessment of information from secondary sources was undertaken in Continuation 546 and the Commission's decision to disregard published steel data for the purposes of determining Daehan's normal value was correct;
- in the context of the apparent acceptance that the Commission may have regard to new information, the Commission now has before it, verified information in respect of Daehan's domestic sales from Review of Measures 566 – steel reinforcing bar exported from the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Spain (except Nervacero S.A.) and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co. Ltd.) (Review 566). Daehan considers this to be the best and only primary sourced information which can be relied on to accurately determine normal values;
- Review 566 information is directly relevant to the reinvestigation as it captures six months relevant to the reinvestigation;

2.1.5 Commission approach to reinvestigation

In Continuation 546 the Commission considered the primary source information submitted by Daehan for the inquiry period to be unreliable and therefore looked to what secondary source information was available to determine Daehan's normal value.

In this reinvestigation the Commission now has before it primary source information, being verified domestic selling prices costs data from Review 566. These sales and costs cover half of the inquiry period (1 July 2019 to 31 December 2019) and the Commission has found the information to be complete and accurate.¹⁷ This information is therefore directly relevant to the reinvestigation of Daehan's normal value for Continuation 546.

The Commission considers that, having regard to all relevant information, Daehan's verified information from Review 566 is the best available information for the purposes of establishing Daehan's normal value in this reinvestigation.

2.2 Korea - normal value and dumping margin finding

2.2.1 Daehan

Normal value

The Commission has determined Daehan's normal value under section 269TAC(6), having regard to all relevant information. Specifically, the Commission has:

- adopted the Quarter 3 - 2019 and Quarter 4 - 2019 normal values provisionally calculated for Daehan in respect of its Australian export models of the goods from verified domestic sales information submitted in Review 566 (review period of 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020); and

¹⁶ EPR 546, record no. 41.

¹⁷ EPR 566, record no. 16.

PUBLIC RECORD

- calculated normal values for Quarter 1 – 2019 and Quarter 2 – 2019, with reference to the Quarter 3 – 2019 normal values calculated in Review 566, applying an adjustment for the movement in South Korean domestic selling prices of rebar between the relevant quarters. The Commission obtained by paid subscription, Korean rebar price surveys from MEPS International Limited (MEPS), for the purposes of making the timing adjustments.

The Commission considers that the MEPS pricing information is the most relevant information available to the Commission having regard to all relevant information. In particular, the Commission considers that the MEPS pricing information is more relevant than the Korean domestic price information included in Confidential Attachment A to InfraBuild's application to the ADRP and Confidential Attachment 2 to InfraBuild's submission dated 2 March 2021. This is because the Commission has obtained the information through paid subscription and is satisfied of the propriety of the information's source and inputs.

In relation to the alternative price surveys presented by InfraBuild, the inputs and methods of compilation are not known to the Commission. Notwithstanding, the Commission compared the change in domestic selling prices across the relevant periods as reflected in this data, to that of the MEPS pricing information. The Commission found that irrespective of the source of the pricing information, the increase in domestic selling prices between the Review 486/489 and Continuation 546 period was material. Further, the resultant dumping margins for Daehan were comparable, regardless of the source of the pricing information.

A comparison of the pricing information from the sources available to the Commission at the time of reinvestigation is at **Confidential Attachment 1** to this report.

Dumping Margin

The dumping margin for Daehan in REP 546 was 3.9 per cent.

The normal value determined for Daehan in this reinvestigation has changed from that determined in REP 546. Consequently, the revised dumping margin is **2.3 per cent**.

The revised variable factors and dumping margin calculation are contained at **Confidential Attachment 2** to this report.

2.2.2 Uncooperative and all other Korean exporters

Normal value

The Commission has determined the normal value for uncooperative and all other Korean exporters under section 269TAC(6), having regard to all relevant information. Specifically, the Commission has adopted the Quarter 3 - 2019 and Quarter 4 - 2019 normal values provisionally calculated for Daehan in Review 566, eliminating however, all favourable adjustments to Daehan's normal value.

The method by which the Commission calculated the normal values for uncooperative all other Korean exporters in Quarter 1 – 2019 and Quarter 2 – 2019 is the same as that described for Daehan.

Dumping Margin

The dumping margin for uncooperative and all other Korean exporters in REP 546 was 4.0 per cent.

PUBLIC RECORD

The normal value determined for uncooperative and all other Korean exporters in this reinvestigation has changed from that determined in REP 546. Consequently, the revised dumping margin for uncooperative and all other Korean exporters is **7.2 per cent**.

The revised variable factors and dumping margin calculation are contained at **Confidential Attachment 3** and **Confidential Attachment 4** to this report.

2.3 Taiwan

2.3.1 No request for reinvestigation for the ADRP

In REP 546, the normal value for uncooperative and all other exporters from Taiwan was determined under section 269TAC(6), adopting the normal value ascertained in ADRP Report No.108 adjusted for the movement in ascertained export prices for all other exporters from Taiwan between the Review 489 and Continuation 546 periods.

In its reinvestigation request to the Commissioner, the ADRP stated that it was advised by the Commission in a conference held on 27 January 2021¹⁸ that should the pricing information provided by InfraBuild be relied on as it related to the rebar market in Taiwan, the effect would be to decrease the negative dumping margin calculated in REP 546. Therefore, the Commissioner's recommendation that the anti-dumping measures applying to exporters from Taiwan be allowed to expire, would remain unchanged. On this basis, the ADRP did not request a reinvestigation of Ground Six of InfraBuild's application for an ADRP review.

2.3.2 InfraBuild submission

In its submission of 2 March 2021, InfraBuild¹⁹ stated that:

- the decision not to continue the measures against the relevant Taiwanese exporters was based on an approach to the calculation of the normal value that the ADRP has not indicated to be correct or preferable. The reason against a request to reinvestigate the normal value finding was the '*statutory constraint*' on what amounted to '*relevant information*' at the time immediately prior to the reinvestigation request;
- the ADRP does not prevent the Commission from considering new pricing information in its reinvestigation, which was supplied in its application for an ADRP review and again in the submission. This should extend to the additional information on movements in selling prices of rebar in Taiwan, such that the Commission should revise its assessment of whether the dumping margin for exporters from Taiwan would remain negative; and
- should the effect of applying the additional pricing information in determining the normal value not be a decrease in the dumping margin, the Commission ought to bring this to the attention of the ADRP, such that a revised assessment is made as to whether to request a reinvestigation of the normal value for exporters from Taiwan.

¹⁸ ADRP Conference Summary – Anti-Dumping Commission (27 January 2021), published on ADRP website on 16 February 2021.

¹⁹ EPR 546, record no. 40.

2.3.3 Commission's response

The Commission notes that the determination of normal values in respect of exporters from Taiwan is not a REP 546 finding within the scope of the reinvestigation request.

The new pricing information put before the Commission in InfraBuild's submission is the same as that in its application for an ADRP review.

In its conference with the ADRP on 27 January 2021, the Commission advised that the dumping margin for exporters from Taiwan would remain negative should either the pricing information provided by InfraBuild in its application to Continuation 546 or its application for an ADRP review be used as an adjustment to the previously ascertained normal value. Therefore, the Commission's conclusion that the effect of using this information would be to decrease the negative dumping margin calculated in REP 546 is preserved.

The Commission's calculations are at **Confidential Attachment 5** to this report.

Further, the Commissioner's finding that the expiration of the measures applying to exports from Taiwan would not be likely to lead to a continuation of, or a recurrence of, dumping and material injury was based on a number of factors as set out in section 7.6.4 of REP 546. That finding was not solely based on the finding that exports from Taiwan were not dumped in the inquiry period.

3 LIKELIHOOD OF DUMPING AND INJURY CONTINUATION OR RECURRING

3.1 ADRP reinvestigation request

To the extent that the dumping margins were altered by a change in the normal values, the ADRP requested that the Commissioner reinvestigate whether the expiration of the measures in respect of Daehan and uncooperative and other Korean exporters would lead or likely to lead, to the material injury that the anti-dumping measure is intended to prevent.²⁰

As a result of the findings in Chapter 2, the Commission has revised the dumping margins from REP 546 as set out in Table 1.

The Commission does not consider that the revised dumping margins in the reinvestigation from those calculated in REP 546 affect the reviewable decision to secure the continuation of the anti-dumping measures applicable to exports of rebar to Australia by Korean exporters.

The Commission found in REP 546 that exports of rebar from Korea during the inquiry period were at dumped prices and that the expiration of anti-dumping measures on Korean rebar would lead or be likely to lead to the continuation of dumping and the material injury that the measures are intended to prevent.

²⁰ Letters from the ADRP to the Commissioner published on the ADRP website on 17 February 2021 and 15 March 2021.

4 CONCLUSION

4.1 Preliminary reinvestigation finding

The Commissioner has conducted a reinvestigation of the reviewable decision in accordance with the direction made by the ADRP as is required by section 269ZZL(2). As a result of this reinvestigation, the Commissioner has found reasons that would result in materially different decisions from the reviewable decisions.

In accordance with section 269ZZL(3)(b), as the Commissioner is of the view that certain new findings can be made as a result of the reinvestigation, he proposes to make new findings as set out in this report, specifically, that different variable factors (being the normal value) have been determined in respect of rebar exported to Australia by Daehan and 'uncooperative and all other Korean exporters'.

In accordance with section 269ZZL(3)(c), the evidence and other material for which new findings are based is contained within this report and its attachments.

This report sets out the reasons for the Commissioner's proposed decision in accordance with section 269ZZL(3)(d).

PUBLIC RECORD

5 ATTACHMENTS

Confidential Attachment 1	Comparison of Korean price survey information
Confidential Attachment 2	Daehan variable factors and dumping margin
Confidential Attachment 3	Uncooperative Korean exporters variable factors
Confidential Attachment 4	Uncooperative Korean exporters dumping margin
Confidential Attachment 5	Taiwan rebar pricing NV and DM