



**PACIFIC AGRISCIENCE PTE LTD**

Company Registration no. 199806146C

GST Registration no. 199806146C

101B Tanjong Pagar Road

Singapore 088522

Tel (65)

6222-9753

Fax (65) 6223-3009

E-mail: [cs@pacificaqriscience.com](mailto:cs@pacificaqriscience.com)

Website: [www.pacificaqriscience.com](http://www.pacificaqriscience.com)

**PUBLIC FILE**

Nov 30, 2012

Tom O'Connor  
Manager

International Trade Remedies Branch | Trade & Compliance Division  
Australian Customs and Border Protection Service  
Customs House, 5 Constitution Ave, Canberra City ACT 2601

Dear Mr O'Connor,

Re: Anti-dumping duty on Chinese formulated Glyphosate — Like Goods — 62% IPA Salt

With reference to your email sent to us on Nov 22, 2012 stating that The Australian Customs Dumping Notice invites submissions in response to the substantive issues identified in the TMRO's report, we wish to specifically make a submission to object to the inclusion of 62% IPA salt in the ensuing investigations.

As I stated in our previous submissions, as the application for anti-dumping duty centres around formulated Glyphosate, it means we are talking about formulated Glyphosate products in which farmers purchase and apply in the field to control weeds.

As also stated previously, surfactant is absolutely critical to the functioning and efficacy of Glyphosate, unlike other herbicides. This is a well known fact. In the

light of this, technically and commercially, if the surfactant used is different, even if the active ingredient content is the same, they are not like goods. Their respective costs and prices would be quite different. Their respective efficacy and performance would also be very different especially under Australian conditions. Turning your attention now to the following points made in the TMRO's report:

“(14) The basis for the applicant's contention that 62 per cent IPA salt should be treated as a like good was that it can be applied to the same use as formulated glyphosate if the end user blends the required volumes of 62 per cent IPA salt, surfactant and water”

We want to highlight to you that:

- A. If what the applicant claimed is that easy for farmers to use a 62% IPA salt, then, they should show you where on earth has there been, and is there, an end-user label for this product? If they can't show even one, then, there should be questions as to why there isn't one at all.
- B. The APVMA in Canberra, not the Customs, should be consulted on this issue of why a 62% IPA salt is not considered by them as an end-use product. It has always been classified and treated as a “manufacturing concentrate”. Likewise, you should also seek explanations from other regulatory agencies around the world as to why 62% IPA salt is not an end-use product.
- C. The world standard surfactant for end-use Glyphosate formulations and for those formulated by Monsanto, the Glyphosate molecule inventor, has been an ethoxylated tallowamine. This surfactant is always blended into the end-use formulations at the manufacturers' plants and never sold in the stores that farmers go to. There are other minor surfactants, in lieu of an ethoxylated tallowamine, that have been used by some formulators for specific situations and formulations in which the standard ethoxylated tallowamine does not suit.
- D. There is a wide range of adjuvants sold in stores that farmers can buy to mix into the spray tank to enhance the efficacy of Glyphosate and other crop protection chemicals under specific field conditions that warrant the addition of such adjuvants to a Glyphosate that is already loaded with a

standard ethoxylated tallowamine surfactant. It is ludicrous to suggest that farmers can buy such adjuvants in the stores to add to water and the 62% IPA salt and they will achieve the efficacy that an ethoxylated tallowamine loaded Glyphosate formulation would give. Monsanto, being the inventor and market leader should also be consulted as to why they would not sell 62% IPA as an end-use product and even remotely consider letting farmers buy and blend in whatever surfactant and adjuvant they so desire.

- E. The bottom-line is that if farmers were to be free to buy adjuvants and surfactants and mix into 62% IPA salt by themselves, surfactant, the right surfactant, being so critical in the performance of this product, they will have mixed results and the stewardship of this product will go out of the window. Monsanto knows this, weed control agronomists know this, and the applicant knows this too! Acid test: Why does the applicant not have a 62% IPA salt sold as an end-use product?

“(15) The applicant said that this mixing (which was frequently done now by glyphosate users) was no more complicated than the addition of water to powdered or dry glyphosate which had been accepted by Customs as being included in the goods under consideration and which, in its dry form, was equally incapable of performing the function of fully formulated glyphosate.”

We want to highlight to you that:

- A. Dry Glyphosate formulations are not all without surfactants loaded. Dry formulations have a minor market-share in any given market. They are there because of specific reasons and applications. For instance, in forestry situations, it is difficult to get rid of empty packaging such as plastic drums for liquid products. Dry formulations allow easily disposable carton boxes to be used.
- B. Dry formulations also allow far higher active ingredient loadings than liquid formulations allow. But, when a certain formulator wants to maximize active ingredient loading for whatever economical reasoning that they want to promote to farmers, then, such dry formulations leave no room for the usual loading of surfactants. But, such a niche market dry formulation with no surfactant loaded will always carry specific recommendations on the

label as to what surfactants or adjuvants need to be added by the farmers at the time of application. It is not what the applicant has suggested i.e. farmers are doing this routinely and that farmers can buy the right surfactants freely from the stores. It is totally misleading.

Our conclusions are that:

1. Glyphosate 62% has not been and is not an end-use product for all the reasons we have given above. It is always classified by regulatory agencies as a “manufacturing concentrate” or an “intermediate”. If farmers were to use this intermediate and mix it with water and any surfactant they can buy in stores, they will have mixed or variable results, leading to poor product stewardship.
2. Furthest from like goods is Glyphosate 62% IPA salt as it does not even contain a surfactant critical for the functioning of Glyphosate as a herbicide.
3. TMRO and Customs should seriously consider the highlights and explanations we have given above, and most of all, consult agronomists, Monsanto and regulatory agencies around the world as to why 62% IPA salt of Glyphosate is not an end-use product and that is not easy at all for farmers to buy the right surfactants to make it work effectively.

Sincerely,



C S Liew  
Managing Director