



Australian Government

Anti-Dumping Review Panel

Anti-Dumping Review Panel
C/O Chief Counsel & Integrity Division
Department of Industry, Science and Resources
10 Binara Street
Canberra City, ACT 2601
02 6276 1781
Email: ADRP@industry.gov.au
Web: www.adreviewpanel.gov.au

By EMAIL

Commissioner of the Anti-Dumping Commission
Anti-Dumping Commission
GPO Box 2013
Canberra ACT 2601

Dear Commissioner,

ADRP Review No. 175 – Aluminium Extrusions exported from the People’s Republic of China

The Anti-Dumping Review Panel (Review Panel) is currently conducting a review of the Reviewable Decision of the Minister for Industry and Innovation and Minister for Science made on 16 October 2025 under section 269ZHG(1) of the *Customs Act 1901* (the Act), applying to aluminium extrusions exported from the People’s Republic of China.

The Review Panel accepted applications for review from the following applicants:

1. Goomax Metal Co., Ltd (Goomax)
2. Guangdong Xingfa Aluminium Co Ltd (Xingfa)
3. Press Metal Aluminium (Australia) Pty Ltd (PMAA)

As you are aware, I am conducting the review.

Pursuant to section 269ZZL of the Act, I require the following finding in Report 657 relating to Goomax being in receipt of Less than Adequate Remuneration (LTAR) subsidy be reinvestigated as outlined in the Reviewable Ground:

The Minister’s decision on the applicable subsidy margin for Goomax was erroneous, as it was premised on the Commissioner’s factual error (mistakenly categorising

privately-held suppliers/manufacturers as state-owned) concerning the receipt of a 'Less than Adequate Remuneration (LTAR) subsidy.

I provide below a summary of my reasons for making the request under s 269ZZL of the Act:

Goomax claims its suppliers of aluminium billet were not state-invested or state-owned enterprises. On this basis, it claims it should not be subject to the LTAR subsidy finding. It provided evidence of the ownership details of its suppliers in its application to the Review Panel.

This information was not provided to the Anti-Dumping Commission (ADC) during the inquiry, though Goomax refers to its response to the exporter questionnaire (REQ) where it declared that its suppliers/manufacturers were not state-invested or state-owned enterprises.

The ADC's submission, dated 19 December 2025, indicates that it had information regarding the ownership of one of Goomax's suppliers, as this supplier also provided raw materials to Jinxiecheng. This information was not provided by Goomax.¹

At the conference held with the ADC on 11 December 2025, the Review Panel was guided through the information the ADC considered in its assessment of the ownership of one of the major manufacturers/suppliers to Goomax. The ADC outlined the desktop research undertaken in this regard.

The Review Panel requests that the ADC review the status of the ownership of Goomax's major suppliers/manufacturers in relation to whether they are state-owned or state-invested enterprises for the purposes of the LTAR subsidy.

If you have any issues in relation to the reinvestigation or if you consider that a conference under s 269ZZHA of the Act would assist in obtaining the further information the subject of the reinvestigation, please contact the Secretariat.

Please could you report the result of the reinvestigation within 60 days, that is, by **20 March 2026**.

If you require more time, including time to allow interested parties the opportunity to comment on an aspect of the reinvestigation, please contact the Secretariat.

Thank you for your assistance.

Yours sincerely,



Jaclyne Fisher OAM
Panel Member
Anti-Dumping Review Panel
19 January 2026

¹ Jinxiecheng provided a submission to the ADC following the Statement of Essential Facts 657, outlining evidence that its suppliers of raw materials were privately owned entities.