



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: UPM Asia Pacific Pte Ltd (UPM-AP)

Applicant	UPM Asia Pacific Pte Ltd (UPM-AP)
Panel Member	Jaclyne Fisher
Date	7 August 2017
Participants	Justin Wickes (Anti-Dumping Commission), Tim King (Anti-Dumping Commission) Steve Spears (Anti-Dumping Commission) for parts of the conference discussion
Time opened	10.00 am
Time closed	12.00 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. Please explain the nature of the VAT adjustment to the normal value and how this has been calculated. In so doing, please refer to the calculations in the relevant spreadsheets.

The Commission provided a copy of Confidential Att 2 to UPM Verification Report which outlined the approach to the adjustment made to the normal value for export VAT. Copies of the confidential letter dated 1 June 2016 provided by UPM which outlined the adjustments which should be made to normal value (incl Export VAT) and the explanation of the UPM contract manufacturing arrangements were provided. The Commission indicated that the adjustment used in the normal value calculation is the one provided by UPM at the verification visit and was verified to the relevant company records. The Commission also indicated that it had considered information from a previous verification visit report for UPM as part of an earlier investigation into the alleged dumping of copy paper exported from China (Investigation 225). The ADC stated that the report explained the VAT adjustment and the amount of the adjustment was similar to the amount claimed in this investigation.

2. On what basis did the Commission determine that the UPM-AP and UPM China should be treated as one entity.

The Commission indicated that a joint response to the exporter questionnaire had been lodged by UPM-AP and UPM China, and it indicated that UPM-China make all the domestic sales in China.

3. Could the Commission confirm its calculation of the dumping margin relates to all sales as there appears to be two different dumping margins in the confidential dumping margin spreadsheet.



The Commission clarified which was the correct spreadsheet relating to the REP 341, which is titled UPM Confidential Post PAD. This demonstrated the dumping margin for UPM of 34.4% as shown in Section 6.8.2.5.