



Anti-Dumping Review Panel - Conference Summary

2017/55 – A4 Copy Paper Exported from the Federative Republic of Brazil, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of Thailand

Applicant: International Paper do Brasil Ltda (IP Brasil)

Applicant	International Paper do Brasil Ltda (IP Brasil)
Panel Member	Jaclyne Fisher
Date	8 August 2017
Participants	Justin Wickes (Anti-Dumping Commission), Tim King (Anti-Dumping Commission) Carl Halpin (Anti-Dumping Commission) for part of the discussion
Time opened	10.30 am
Time closed	12.30 pm

Purpose

The purpose of this conference is to obtain further information in relation to the review before the ADRP, in relation to A4 Copy Paper exported from the Federative Republic of Brazil, the People's Republic of China, the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of Thailand.

In the course of this conference, I may ask parties to clarify an argument, claim or specific detail contained in the party's application or submission. The conference is not a formal hearing of the review, and is not an opportunity for parties to argue their case before me.

I have only had regard to information provided at this conference that relates to relevant information (within the meaning of section 269ZZK(6) of the *Customs Act 1901*). Any conclusions reached at this conference are based on that relevant information.

Discussion

1. The Panel Member asked the Commission to confirm which sales had been used for normal value purposes?

The Commission indicated it had undertaken model matching and had only used sales to the same level as trade as that of the export sales to Australia. It demonstrated the calculations by reference to the relevant confidential spreadsheets.

2. The Panel Member asked the Commission to outline the analysis it had undertaken in determining that a brand adjustment was not appropriate to enable a comparison between the normal value and export price.

The Commission demonstrated through reference to the confidential spreadsheet on domestic sales which models had been used for comparison purposes. It then provided a copy of the pricing analysis of these models in the Brazilian market and stated that it considered this analysis underpinned the conclusions outlined in section 6.7.3.1, that is, proprietary labelled models had both higher and lower prices than the equivalent privately labelled model. On this basis, the Commission was not satisfied that the request for an adjustment for branded products was required. It also commented that it is difficult to quantify the value of branding as this may not necessarily reflect the price.

3. The Panel Member asked the Commission to elaborate on its decision to use the Brazilian interest rate in determining an adjustment amount for export credit noting the applicant's position that the US interest rate (the currency of the sales to Australia) should be used.



The Commission indicated that it had considered using the prime interest rate prevailing for commercial loans for that currency eg LIBOR plus risk premium, however the applicant had failed to provide a suitable risk premium. It then assessed what rate it considered appropriate in the circumstances. It outlined the information provided to it by the applicant in relation to:

- what accounts are held in the domestic market;
- the treatment of sales made in foreign currencies;
- Profit and Loss statement which contained foreign currency loss/gain and costs
- the terms available on the domestic market to customers.

The Commission also noted that there was an increase in the Brazilian Real against the US dollar during this period. It stated that in these circumstances it considered the most appropriate rate was the rate available to the applicant in the domestic market