

From: Roger Simpson <roger@panpac.biz>
Sent: Wednesday, 2 October 2013 11:13 AM
To: FARRANT Kim
Cc: Drew.Elsbury@cockburncement.com.au; Vince.Valastro@cockburncement.com.au
Subject: Resumed investigation - quicklime from Thailand

Dear Kim,

I understand that you are the CEO's delegate in the resumed investigation concerning quicklime from Thailand.

The question of Cockburn's loss of revenue and profit in the context of losses to the whole Australian industry is obviously going to be a major issue in the resumed investigation.

In Termination Report No. 179A (TER 179A) Customs' claims that the revenue lost by Cockburn during the period January 2010 to June 2011 represents less than 1% lost revenue to the whole Australian industry (sec 7.4). We now know, from the ADRP's report, that this "less than 1%" revenue loss claimed by Customs is 0.6%. Neither TER 179A nor the public file provide any information supporting this claim.

We request your early advice of how Customs came to this conclusion that the revenue lost by Cockburn during the said period represents 0.6% of revenue lost by the whole Australian industry, eg which companies were considered by Customs to constitute the whole Australian industry and what data relating to those companies provided the basis for Customs' conclusion.

In addition, the ADRP report (para 58) states that in the original investigation Customs contacted 12 Australian quicklime producers other than Cockburn but only 3 of them responded. There is no public record of which companies were contacted and which of them responded. Consequently we request your early advice of the identities of the companies contacted and those which responded.

Thanks and regards,
Roger