



Conference Summary

Review No. 180 – Hot rolled coil steel exported from the People’s Republic of China

Panel Member	Jaclyne Fisher OAM
Review type	Review of Minister’s decision
Date	11 June 2026
Participants	Baoshan Iron and Steel Co., Ltd (Baoshan), Baosteel Zhanjiang Iron and Steel Co., Ltd (Zhanjiang) and Shanghai Meishan Iron and Steel Co., Ltd (Meishan) Applicant’s Representative: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• John Bracic, Director – J Bracic & Associates Anti-Dumping Commission representatives: [REDACTED]
Time opened	8:30am AEST
Time closed	8.40am AEST

Purpose

The Anti-Dumping Review Panel (Review Panel) opened the conference with an Acknowledgment of Country.

The purpose of this conference was to obtain further information in relation to the applications before the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (Review Panel) in relation to hot rolled coil steel (the goods) exported from the People’s Republic of China (China).

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 the Applicant’s representative to clarify any argument, claim or specific detail contained in the applications. The conference was not a formal hearing of the review and was not an opportunity for parties to argue their case before me.

In accordance with section 269ZZHA(2), in making a recommendation under subsection 269ZZK(1), I may have regard to:

- (a) further information provided at this conference to the extent that it relates to “relevant information” within the meaning of section 269ZZK(6) of the Act;
- (b) any conclusions reached at this conference based on “that relevant information”.

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



Australian Government
Anti-Dumping Review Panel

- That the conference was being recorded and transcribed by Microsoft Teams (as facilitated by the Review Panel's Secretariat), 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, the 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 participant 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.

Further information requested

The specific information that the Review Panel sought in this conference was in relation to the three applications for Baoshan, Zhanjiang and Meishan.

Prior to the commencement of the conference, Mr Bracic provided an updated 'authority to represent' each of the applicants. The Review Panel requested that clarification of certain information in the applications be provided:

1. In each application, ground (2) shown on page 14 is different to the stated ground at page 5:

Mr Bracic indicated that this would be amended to reflect the ground shown on page 5.

2. In Baoshan's application at page 16, there is a screenshot of the calculation of the iron ore as % of raw material cost of HRC. The Meishan and Zhanjiang applications have the calculation amount but do not provide the screenshot of the calculation: should this additional screenshot be provided for the other two applicants?



Mr Bracic indicated that it would be provided for the Meishan and Zhanjiang applications.

3. Certain areas of the three applications provide specific references for WTO Panel Reports, whereas other areas refer to particular Panel Reports but do not supply the relevant references: could the specific references be provided please.

Mr Bracic will update the references.

4. Could the applicant clarify that the response to Ground 3, Question 10 provides its overall correct or preferable decision based on all its grounds, rather than only its Ground 3.

Mr Bracic indicated that it was a summary and it will be updated to reflect the response to Ground 3 only.

The Review Panel requested that Mr Bracic update each of the applications with the specific information identified at today's conference, include a footnote noting that this information had been updated and provide this information to the Secretariat. Mr Bracic indicated it would be provided within one working day.

The Review Panel notes that the adjusted applications to deal with the issues identified during the conference were provided to the Secretariat on 12 June 2026.

The Review Panel thanked the participants and indicated that the conference summary would be provided within one working day for any comments regarding confidentiality and/or accuracy and requested that responses be provided within two working days.