



ADRP Conference Summary

ADRP Reviews 120 and 121 – Hot Rolled Structural Steel Sections (HRSS) exported from Japan, the Republic of Korea, Taiwan (except by Feng Hsin Steel Co Ltd) and the Kingdom of Thailand

Panel Member	Jaclyne Fisher
Review type	Reviews of Minister's Decisions
Date	18 February 2020
Participants	Justin Wickes, Jasna Halilovic and Jessie Wai representing the Anti-Dumping Commission (ADC)
Time opened	1.00 pm AEDT
Time closed	1.20 pm AEDT

Purpose

The purpose of this conference was to obtain further information in relation to the reviews before the Anti-Dumping Review Panel (Review Panel) in relation to HRSS exported from Japan, the Republic of Korea (Korea), Taiwan and the Kingdom of Thailand (Thailand). The applications relate to a review pursuant to s.269ZDB(1) (review of measures) and another pursuant to s.269ZHG(1) (continuation inquiry) of the *Customs Act 1901* (the Act).

The conference was held pursuant to section 269ZZHA of the Act.

In the course of the conference, I may have asked parties to clarify an argument, claim or specific detail contained in the party's application or submission. 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 as it relates to relevant information (within the meaning of section 269ZZK(6) of the Act). Any conclusions reached at this conference are based on that relevant information. 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:



Australian Government

Anti-Dumping Review Panel

- 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 (non-confidential version) 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 this conference; and
- The recording being dealt with as set out in the Privacy Statement.

Discussion

The Review Panel Member advised that the reviewable decision relates to the decision of the Minister to vary the 'variable factors' for TS Steel Co., Ltd (TS Steel) following a review of measures. The specific information that the Review Panel sought in this conference was in reference to the normal value finding as follows:

- (1) Could the ADC elaborate on the methodology used to establish the normal value for TS Steel by reference to the relevant spreadsheets, particularly in relation to what goods were considered 'like goods' to those exported to Australia (MCC code [REDACTED]).

The ADC referred to confidential spreadsheet No. 42 - TS Steel Domestic Sales - which included sales of the models with the MCC code of [REDACTED], the model most "like" the goods exported to Australia. It was noted by the ADC that there were no sales of the exported model [REDACTED] on the domestic market in the OCOT. In terms of the sufficiency test, there was discussion as to whether there were sufficient domestic sales of the model most like the exported model. The ADC confirmed that there were sufficient volumes of the model [REDACTED] pursuant to s.269TAC(14) of the Act. (The ADC did identify that one cell in the spreadsheet was incorrectly labelled but this had no impact on any of its calculations). The ADC referred to confidential spreadsheet No. 43 - TS Steel Appendix 4 NV - for the normal value determination.



Australian Government
Anti-Dumping Review Panel

(2) Could the ADC advise how the calculation of the credit adjustment was undertaken?

The ADC advised that the calculation for the credit adjustment was shown in Confidential Attachment Sheet 43 - TS Steel NV. The ADC stepped the Review Panel through this calculation process.

(3) In the benchmark exercise for TS Steel, could the ADC advise whether this normal value was based on the constructed methodology or domestic selling price.

The ADC confirmed that the normal value information used in the benchmarking exercise for TS Steel was based on the constructed methodology.

The Review Panel advised that a draft of the conference summary would be provided to participants within one working day in order to ensure that it is an accurate reflection of the conference and for identification of any confidential information for redaction.

It would be appreciated if participant's responses could be provided within two working days.

The Review Panel requested that the participants provide the following information following the conference:

- The ADC to confirm the sufficiency test for the domestic model most like the goods exported to Australia. The ADC confirmed this information.