



ADRP Conference Summary

Review No. 130 – Steel Reinforcing Bar exported from the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Spain (except Nervacero S.A.) and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co. Ltd)

Panel Member	Scott Ellis
Review type	Review of Minister's decision
Date	28 January 2021
Participants	Charles Zhan and Maddison Godwin (of Moulis Legal), for Celsa
Time opened	11.00am AEDT
Time closed	11.30am AEDT

Purpose

The purpose of this conference was to obtain further information in relation to the review before the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (Review Panel) in relation to steel reinforcing bar exported from the Republic of Korea, Singapore, Spain (except Nervacero S.A.) and Taiwan (except Power Steel Co. Ltd).

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

In the course of the conference, I was able to ask parties to clarify any argument, claim or specific detail contained in their 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 will only have regard to information provided at this conference to the extent that it relates to relevant information within the meaning of section 269ZZK 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 may have regard to and, therefore, is 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 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 the conference; and
- The recording being dealt with as set out in the Privacy Statement.

Discussion

A list of matters about which information might be sought was circulated prior to the conference. A common list was used for conferences with the ADC and subsequent conferences with other participants in the review. Mr Zhan indicated that Celsa did not have comments in relation to topics 1 to 6.

7. Details of the exports of the goods to Australia by Celsa in 2020.

Celsa did not and was not required to provide this information to the ADC during the inquiry. It must have been provided by InfraBuild or obtained by ADC from the ABF data. There were [REDACTED] sales by Celsa to Australia in 2020, totaling about [REDACTED] tonnes. [REDACTED]. There were [REDACTED] made over [REDACTED]. [REDACTED]. The goods would have arrived in [REDACTED] of 2020. These sales were not so significant, representing less than [REDACTED] of what Celsa used to sell to Australia and is negligible in terms of total imports into Australia and the Australian market as a whole. The amount is about [REDACTED] of Celsa's total revenue and about [REDACTED] of Celsa's total domestic sales (i.e. in Spain) of rebar during the 1 July 2019 to 30 June 2020 period. There had been a decline in export sales by Celsa (i.e. sales other than to the Spanish market).



8. *What is the 'actual commercial information' referred to at page 13 of the review application by Celsa that supported the contentions in the bullet points on that page.*

This information was provided in responses to the SEF.

There were three main points. First, no exports to Australia. Second, sales of rebar to the Spanish market was more than [REDACTED] of Celsa's total rebar sales. Sales to EU common market areas were [REDACTED] of rebar sales. The trend away from export sales has continued. Celsa is achieving a profit of [REDACTED] on sales in the domestic market.

There is also a shift away from the production of the goods to wire rod, which is not the goods under consideration. Celsa was operating at [REDACTED] capacity, which is high in the industry.

9. *The extent to which straights and coil are interchangeable products.*

The two types of bar are interchangeable, subject to the issues of equipment for coil. There is a slightly higher cost for coil, but more efficient usage for coil.

However, the cheaper straights products – such as those from Turkey could be priced so competitively that offset the efficiency advantage of coil. Also, Celsa's Australian sales have been spooled coil only, which is a prime product. The price paid for the goods from Celsa following the inquiry period for the continuation inquiry would have been over [REDACTED] per tonne, which is comparatively quite expensive. The goods sold by Celsa would have been subject to 5% tax in any event. Celsa's coil is not a cheap product.

Scott Ellis

Member

Anti-Dumping Review Panel

9 February 2021