



# ADRP Conference Summary

## 2018/84 Steel Reinforcing Bar exported from the People's Republic of China

Panel Member	Paul O'Connor
Review type	Review of Minister's Decision Steel Reinforcing Bar - ADRP Review No. 84
Date	29 June 2018
Participants	Justin Wickes and Joe Crowley Anti-Dumping Commission (ADC) Representatives
Time opened	14:00 AEST
Time closed	14:20 AEST

### Purpose

The purpose of this conference was to obtain further information in relation to the Review 84 before the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (ADRP) in relation to Steel Reinforcing Bar exported from the People's Republic of China.

The conference was held pursuant to section 269ZZHA of the *Customs Act 1901* (the Act).

In the course of the conference, I may have asked the ADC representatives to clarify an argument, claim or specific detail contained in the party's application or submission and in the relevant ADC report. The conference was not a formal hearing of the review, and was not an opportunity for parties to argue their case before me.

I have only had regard to information provided at this conference as it relates to relevant information (within the meaning of section 269ZZK(6) of the Act). Any conclusions reached at this conference are based on that relevant information. Information that relates to some new argument not previously put in an application or submission is not something that the ADRP has regard to, and is therefore not reflected in this conference summary.

### Discussion

The specific information that the ADRP sought in this conference was:

1. Reference was made to paragraph 5 of the Conference Summary of the conference with Mr Bracic on 22 June 2018, where he acknowledged Ground 3 of the Jiangsu Yonggang Group Co., Ltd (Yonggang) application was now limited to the ADC's failure to include in the benchmarking exercise, cost data from an integrated Vietnamese producer.



**Australian Government**  
**Anti-Dumping Review Panel**

2. Reference was also made to the earlier conference with the ADC representatives in which the Review Panel was advised it was not appropriate to have regard to the Vietnamese integrated producer's data because that data was only provided on an aggregated basis and was not recorded on a quarterly basis. Mr Bracic is now suggesting that at verification of the Vietnamese producer's records the cost of billet was provided on a monthly basis.
3. The ADC representatives undertook to again look to the documents and information relating to the Vietnamese producer. From recollection, the ADC representatives suggested that although cost data was provided on a quarterly basis, it only related to the finished goods (rebar) and not to the quarterly cost of the steel billet.
4. Reference was also made to the spreadsheets which the ADC had provided as a result of the recalculation of the export price. The ADC representatives confirmed the recalculation resulted in a reduction of all dumping margins. The ADC representatives confirmed that the normal values remained unchanged.
5. I requested that the ADC provide further information to confirm what data the Vietnamese producer had submitted and the reason it was not adopted by the ADC.

Paul O'Connor

Panel Member

Anti-Dumping Review Panel

24 July 2018