



ADRP Conference Summary

Review No. 132 - Aluminium Micro-Extrusions exported from the People's Republic of China

Panel Member	Joan Fitzhenry
Review type	Review of Commissioner's decision
Date	1 June 2021
Participants	Rhys Piper and Heidi Yang (Anti-Dumping Commission)
Time opened	10.00 am AEST
Time closed	10.29 am AEST

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 aluminium micro-extrusions exported from the People's Republic of China.

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

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 to the extent that it relates to information that was before the Commissioner when the Commissioner made the reviewable decision. Any conclusions reached at this conference are based on that information that was before the Commissioner when the Commissioner made the reviewable decision. 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 would then be published on the Review Panel's website.



Australian Government
Anti-Dumping Review Panel

- 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

The specific information that the Review Panel sought in this conference was with respect to a document created by the ADC titled "ADC DM Scenarios testing" (the Document").

1. Line A of the document

I referred to the first line of the Document referring to the S.269TAC(2)(a) calculation for the costs of production of Guangdong Jiangsheng Aluminium Co., Ltd (JSA) and sought confirmation that this calculation was what was referenced at the top of page 27 of Termination Report 542 (TER 542). The ADC representatives confirmed this was correct.

2. Line B of the Document

I noted that the calculation at line B of the document was with respect to JSA's costs of production being increased by ██████¹ and asked for the basis for this percentage increase. The ADC representatives advised that there was no scientific reason for it. It was noted that from modeling information provided by Aluminium Shapemakers Pty Ltd (Alushapes) the output difference between a micro and a general extrusion is ██████████² and recovery of the waste metal is a certain percentage rather than full recovery.

The ADC representatives explained that JSA can fully recover their scrap metal so that was taken into consideration. The ADC was using different percentages of cost differential to see how it affected the dumping margin calculation. They confirmed that even if you used the

¹ Confidential to Alushapes

² Confidential to Alushapes



Australian Government
Anti-Dumping Review Panel

increased costs in Alushapes' contentions, it made little difference to the negative dumping margin.

3. Powder coating costs

I referred to the comments on page 27 and 33 of TER 542 regarding the powder coating cost not having a material impact on the total cost to make (CTM) for the goods. I asked for information in the documents regarding the basis for that comment.

The ADC representatives noted that both exporters were integrated manufacturers. Powder coating is just one step after the extrusion. After the product is extruded there would be a different finish. They also referred to the work program document and the detailed allocation of the cost. They tested the powder coating workshop for each exporter as detailed within the work program. They did not identify as significant out of the costs, the costing for powder coating. It was just one step in the production cost.

They noted that Alushapes does not have its own powder coating line, which means it anticipated cost of powder coating in China was based on its own costs of outsourcing this step.

In the verification process for both exporters, powder coating was just one step of the production. The information is in the detail in the allocation and how the ADC tested each powder coating cost in their work program for each exporter.

I was referred to the relevant folder in the ADC documents for the work programs.

Note for interested parties

The information discussed at the conference with the ADC representatives is referenced at pages 27 to 28 and pages 33 to 34 of the ADC Termination Report No 542