



ADRP Conference Summary

ADRP Reviews 120 and 121 – Hot Rolled Structural Steel Sections (HRSS) exported from Japan, the Republic of Korea, Taiwan (except by Feng Hsin Steel Co Ltd) and the Kingdom of Thailand

Panel Member	Jaclyne Fisher
Review type	Reviews of Minister's Decisions
Date	11 March 2020
Participants	Justin Wickes and Jasna Halilovic representing the Anti-Dumping Commission (ADC)
Time opened	9.30 am AEDT
Time closed	9.45 am AEDT

Purpose

The purpose of this conference was to obtain further information in relation to the reviews before the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (Review Panel) in relation to HRSS exported from Japan, the Republic of Korea (Korea), Taiwan and the Kingdom of Thailand (Thailand). The applications relate to a review pursuant to section 269ZDB(1) (review of measures) and another pursuant to section 269ZHG(1) (continuation inquiry) of the *Customs Act 1901* (the Act).

The conference was held pursuant to section 269ZZHA of the Act.

In the course of the conference, I may have asked parties to clarify an argument, claim or specific detail contained in the party's application or submission. 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 Review Panel has regard to and is therefore not reflected in this conference summary.

At the time of the conference, I advised the participants:



- That the conference was being recorded and transcribed by Express Virtual Meetings Pty Ltd, and that the recording would capture everything said during the conference.
- That the conference was being recorded for the Review Panel to have regard to when preparing a conference summary. The conference summary (non-confidential version) would then be published on the Review Panel's website.
- Any confidential information discussed during the conference would be redacted from the conference summary prior to publication.

Prior to the conference, participants were provided with a copy of the Review Panel's Privacy Statement. The Privacy Statement outlines who the conference recording and transcript may be disclosed to. The Privacy Statement is available on the Review Panel's website [here](#). The participants indicated that they understood the Privacy Statement and consented to:

- The recording of this conference; and
- The recording being dealt with as set out in the Privacy Statement.

Discussion

The Review Panel Member (Review Panel) advised that the reviewable decisions relate to the decisions of the Minister to vary the 'variable factors' for certain exporters following a review of measures, and to continue the anti-dumping measures for certain exports following a continuation review. The specific information that the Review Panel sought in this conference was in reference to the normal value finding, as follows:

- (1) The ADC provided a confidential attachment to its submission to the Review Panel dated 17 February 2020. Could the ADC explain the content of the spreadsheet.

The ADC advised that this document had been prepared from Hyundai's confidential pricing and costing information and plotted, for each quarter, the weighted average price and cost for each of the models that made up the MCC grouping of the model exported to Australia. Except in Quarter 1 2018, there was an inconsistent relationship between costs and prices. This was referenced in its analysis on adjustments to normal value for physical differences and model matching in REP 499 (pages 32 to 34).

- (2) In Section 6 of Report 499, the ADC dealt with non-injurious price (NIP) and refers to the fact that it followed similar methodology as in the original investigation. The Dumping and Subsidy Policy Manual (November 2018) indicates that 'When



Australian Government

Anti-Dumping Review Panel

establishing the Unsuppressed selling price (USP)/NIP in reviews under Division 5 of Part XVB of the Act, the Commission will generally not depart from the approach taken in the original investigation or previous reviews, unless there has been a change in circumstances that either makes the earlier USP approach unreasonable, or less preferred amongst the other available options'. (Dumping and Subsidy Manual November 2018, page 137).

Was any assessment undertaken of the un-dumped export prices in the Australian market as the un-suppressed selling price?

The ADC advised that generally for confidentiality reasons it does not use a single exporter's un-dumped selling prices in Australia for un-suppressed selling price purposes. It has not included any analysis of this in REP 499.

The Review Panel advised that a draft of the conference summary would be provided to participants within one working day in order to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the conference and for identification of any confidential information for redaction. It would be appreciated if participant's responses could be provided within two working days.