



Anti-Dumping Review Panel - Conference Summary

2017/66 – Aluminium Zinc Coated Steel and Zinc Coated (Galvanised) Steel Exported from the Republic of Korea

Applicant: Dongbu Steel Co Ltd (Dongbu)

Applicant	Dongbu Steel Co Ltd (Dongbu)
Panel Member	Jaclyne Fisher
Date	6 October 2017
Participants	Ryan Wilson (Anti-Dumping Commission - ADC), Rhys Piper (ADC)
Time opened	11.00 am
Time closed	11.30 am

Purpose

The purpose of this conference is to obtain further information in relation to the review before the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (the Review Panel), in relation to the review of measures report undertaken by the ADC on Aluminium Zinc Coated Steel and Zinc Coated (Galvanised) Steel (the goods) exported from the Republic of Korea.

In the course of this conference, I may ask the ADC 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 ADC to clarify the source of the confidential data provided to the Review Panel used to assess the changes in the Hot Rolled Coil (HRC) as it appeared to only cover the period up to July 2016.

The ADC advised that the confidential HRC data provided was part of Dongbu's applications for a review of measures (for Aluminium Zinc Coated Steel and for Zinc Coated (Galvanised) Steel) and while assessed as part of the application process was not further used by the ADC. It noted that it showed information up until July 2016 and it had also received information from Dongbu for September 2016.

The ADC confirmed that it had used SBB data (given it has a subscription) to examine trends in HRC prices and these related to East Asia HRC Market prices (CFR US\$/T) as well as other information on HRC prices in the context of other investigations being undertaken on the above mentioned goods as well as on Hollow Structural Sections for the purposes of this review. The Review Panel asked the ADC to provide a copy of the SBB pricing information used for the analysis of pricing trends used in the review of measures. A confidential graph of SBB East Asia HRC Market Prices as referred to by the ADC above, was provided subsequent to the conference.

2. The Panel Member asked if there was any further analysis undertaken regarding long term pricing trends given its statement in the report "there is no evidence to establish current raw material prices are sustained, or more representative, than the prices verified in the review period".



The ADC advised that they relied on the information provided by Dongbu, the SBB information referred to above and also considered HRC pricing information available as part of other investigations being conducted concurrently in order to assess the BlueScope submission on changed HRC pricing subsequent to the review period. The ADC also highlighted that the BlueScope submission detailed prices in AUD per ton, whereas the ADC considered it more appropriate to assess the prices in the Korean currency or in US\$/T given HRC is an internationally traded commodity and is commonly priced in US\$/T. The BlueScope pricing information reflects the currency (exchange rate) changes with the Australian dollar in the recent period.

The ADC indicated that in undertaking its analysis, it relied on its broad understanding of the trends in steel prices in the Asian region, given the number of steel related cases undertaken over the last few years. It noted that the steel (and its raw materials) markets do fluctuate from time to time and that any 12 month period will differ from another 12 month period.

It stated that it is difficult to forecast changes in prices of steel, but did examine the long term trends in HRC (US\$/T) since 2010 in forming its view regarding price trends. It did not agree with BlueScope's claims regarding whether the upswing in prices would be sustained, or that the latter period was any more relevant noting the trend over the previous 5 years. It stated that it considered it appropriate to rely on the review period established when the review of measures was publicly notified.

3. The Panel Member asked whether any other evidence was considered besides the normal value in determining the export price for Dongbu in the absence of any exports by Dongbu during the review period.

The ADC did give consideration as to whether there were other exports by other sellers in the market or other information that might have been relevant for the purposes of S.269TAB(3). It also noted that other reviews of measures relating to the goods involving China and Taiwan were being conducted concurrently and it did consider this information, though with some caution. However, for a variety of reasons, including the volumes, model differences, timing (did not align exactly with the sales of Dongbu in the domestic market) as well as different markets, it did not consider this information was more relevant than the Dongbu ascertained normal value. The ADC also noted that it is usual practice to establish an export price by reference to the normal value when there have been no exports by the exporter during the period under review.