

**Summary record of Anti-Dumping Review Panel (ADRP) Conference with the Anti-Dumping Commission held under Section 269ZZHA of the *Customs Act 1901* (Customs Act) in relation to the ADRP Review regarding Zinc Coated (Galvanised) Steel exported from The Republic of Korea, Taiwan and The People's Republic of China.**

**Date: 1 August 2016**

**Teleconference call commenced at 1530hrs**

**Participants:** Joan Fitzhenry (Chair, ADRP Senior Member) and Rhys Piper (Anti-Dumping Commission) and Roman Maevsky (Anti-Dumping Commission)

**Summary**

1. Joan Fitzhenry (Joan) opened the conference call and participants introduced themselves.
2. Joan advised the conference is being held pursuant to section 269ZZHA of the *Customs Act 1901* (Act) and that a non-confidential summary will be published on the ADRP website. Joan confirmed that the summary would be provided to the Anti-Dumping Commission (ADC) prior to publication.
3. The ADC provided an overview of the process undertaken to be satisfied that had the circumvention goods not been slightly modified, the circumvention goods would have been the subject of a notice under s 269TG(2) or s 269TJ(2) of the Act (Notice), for the purpose of s 48(2)(d) of the *Customs (International Obligations) Regulation 2015* (Regulation). The ADC discussed how the ADC considered relevant tariff concession orders.
4. Joan asked the ADC how the Commissioner went about satisfying himself that the circumvention goods were not excluded or otherwise covered by a tariff concession order and therefore would have not covered been covered by a Notice if not modified.
5. The ADC indicated there was no evidence that the circumvention goods were the subject of a tariff concession, noting that no claim had been raised in the course of the investigation that the circumvention goods would have been covered by a Notice because of a tariff concession order had they not been modified. The ADC also commented on other evidence relating to the particular exports that made those exports unlikely to be excluded or subject to tariff concession orders, which are mainly for automotive and special type steels.
6. Joan summarised that the ADC was of the view that it had sufficient information before it to be satisfied that the circumvention goods would have been covered by a Notice. Joan remarked that the level of satisfaction and the evidence that the ADC had relied on in reaching that level of satisfaction were not apparent in the Report.
7. The ADC responded that it can provide further information in the reinvestigation report.