



Conference Summary

Review No. 181 - Certain strata steel bolts exported from the People's Republic of China

Panel Member	Jan Redfern
Review type	Review of Minister's decision
Date	Friday 2 October 2026
Participants	Representation for Anto: [REDACTED] [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Time opened	11.00am AEST
Time closed	11:21am 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 review before the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (Review Panel) in relation to certain strata steel bolts exported from the People's Republic of 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 provide participants the opportunity to provide further information in relation to the issues raised in Ground 1 of the application and, in particular, the matters addressed in the Commissioner's s 269ZZJ submission concerning that ground. 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:



- 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, 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.

Further information requested

The specific information sought by the Review Panel at the conference concerned the Commission's submissions on Ground 1, particularly whether the procedural fairness issue identified in the notice under section 269ZZI constituted a new ground raised outside the permissible review period or was sufficiently connected to ANTO's original application.

ANTO submitted that the procedural fairness issue did not constitute a separate or new ground for review. Rather, it was embedded—or "anchored"—in Ground 1 of its application dated 18 June 2026. ANTO referred to its original claims that the Commission had not explained its difference in approach and that this inconsistency had prejudiced ANTO by affording Sandvik and Tanrimine an entitlement that was not afforded to ANTO.

ANTO further submitted that the procedural fairness issue was a restatement or clarification of its original ground, informed by further information provided by the Commission at the earlier conference. It relied on section 269ZZHA(2), noting that the Review Panel may have regard to further information obtained at a conference where it relates to relevant information considered by the Commissioner, and to conclusions reached at the conference based on



that information.

ANTO contended that the issue concerned its profit calculation, which was information already considered during the investigation. It submitted that the conclusion that ANTO had not been given an opportunity to make submissions on that calculation could be drawn from the relevant information discussed at the earlier conference. ANTO therefore maintained that it had not introduced a new ground after lodging its application and that the Review Panel could consider the issue within the scope of Ground 1.

The Review Panel clarified that ANTO's written response would not be treated as a further submission, but as a written response to the request for information made at the conference. The conference was held open until the written response was received later that day. An extract of ANTO's written response is included at Annexure A



Annexure A — Extract of ANTO’s written response provided following the conference

ANTO does not accept that the procedural fairness issue, as articulated in the s 269ZZI Notice, constitutes a separate ground for review incapable of being considered by the Review Panel.

This issue is embedded (or to adopt the language contained in the Commission’s submission at [46], is “anchored”) in Ground 1 of ANTO’s application dated 18 June 2026. That application explicitly states that the “Commission failed to provide an explanation for [the] difference in approach” (at [13]) and that the inconsistency in approach prejudiced ANTO by providing an entitlement to Sandvik and Tanrimine not afforded to ANTO (at [15]).

The alleged “new” procedural fairness limb is merely a restatement of the grounds already contained in ANTO’s application, as affirmed by the information provided by the Commission at the conference with the Review Panel on 7 August 2026.

Under section 269ZZHA(2) of the Customs Act 1901 (Cth), the Review Panel may have regard to further information obtained at a conference, to the extent that it relates to the relevant information (being the information the Commissioner had regard to in making his findings in the report to the Minister which led to the Reviewable Decision), and any conclusions reached at the conference based on that relevant information. The statement contained in the s 269ZZI Notice to which the Commission objects relates to information which the Commissioner would already have had regard to during the investigation, being ANTO’s profit calculation. That ANTO was deprived of the opportunity to make submissions during the investigation is also capable of being characterised as a conclusion reached at the conference with the Review Panel based on that relevant information.