Submission to the Commissioner – Investigation 691

Aluminium Windows and Doors

Oct 21, 2026

Balmain & Co Pty Ltd

Dear Commissioner,

Investigation No. 691 – Aluminium windows and doors exported to Australia from the People's Republic of China

Submission in response to Statement of Essential Facts No. 691 and Preliminary Affirmative Determination No. 691 (TRN 2026/147)

1. Interested party making this submission

Case	Investigation No. 691 – Aluminium windows and doors, China
Lodged by	Eric Lambers - Balmain & Co Pty Ltd
Contact	0491 227 269
On behalf of	Balmain & Co Pty Ltd (ABN 71 613 663 817) L1/168-174 Dorcas Street South Melbourne, 3011
Role in the Industry	Commercial builder that purchases imported aluminium windows and doors for installation in its projects

The overwhelming majority of Commercial Projects valued approx. $10m or more would procure windows from China, and have been doing so for 10 years and more. Otherwise projects are simply not viable. Windows are typically purchased from the factory directly, or Australian importers; in .

It is estimated that window supply accounts for 2% of Commercial Construction Contracts. Based on Victoria alone, the commercial construction industry accounts for approx. $18bn p.a.; a 25% rise on window supply would account for $90m (25%) – $252m (70%). Taking this approach across Australia based on QLD, NSW and WA; this amount increases up to $270-750m.

2. Introduction and summary

We act as a stakeholder in the commercial construction industry, and make this submission in response to Statement of Essential Facts No. 691 (SEF 691) and the preliminary affirmative determination and securities notified in TRN 2026/147 on 14 October 2026.

In summary, we submit that:

1. **Goods scope** – the goods description is too broad. It inadvertently captures custom, 2specialized products that the Australian industry does not make in commercial volumes, and these should be excluded.
2. **Injury and causation** – any injury to the Australian industry is explained by factors other than dumping, chiefly the downturn in residential building activity and rising input and labour costs. The "material injury" finding should be revisited.
3. **Dumping margins and securities** – the preliminary margins, and in particular the 70.4% rate (73.3% effective security) for uncooperative and all other exporters, are not reliably grounded and impose a disproportionate burden on downstream users.
4. **Material loss to Contractors** – The duties / tariffs are imposed on many projects and Subcontractors who have already executed Head Contracts. Relief from Clients is unlikely, so this will either be worn by small business builders, or small business Subcontractors, increasing the likelihood of insolvency in an industry that is already struggling.
5. **Costs will be passed on to end users** – Windows will still need to be procured from offshore and the costs will be passed onto end users; further increasing the costs of living

We ask the Commissioner to take these matters into account before reporting to the Minister by 16 December 2026.

3. Goods scope and exclusions

The goods are described in ADN No. 2025/115. We ask that the following be excluded from any dumping or countervailing duty notice:

Proposed exclusion	Why it should be excluded
Windows on Class 2-9 Projects	Windows on Class 2 projects are often not produced by the Australian industry in commercial volumes; Ventora Group is primarily Stegbar and Trend Windows. They do not feature prominently in Class 2 – 9 construction and have not for a long period of time. The report refers to a downturn over the last couple of years – this is not caused by Commercial Class 2 – 9 projects
Projects with Town Planning Permits previously issued	Commercial Developers and Builders base their business case and feasibility on certain rates and revenues. Whilst the tariffs aim to protect the local window manufacturing industry, the unintended impact is that projects already commenced or soon to commence will suffer substantial losses.

Where the Australian industry does not produce like goods, imports of those goods cannot have caused it injury. We ask the Commissioner to address each proposed exclusion in the final report and, if necessary, to recommend a tighter goods description or tariff classification to protect the local Development and Construction industry; which employs a far greater amount of people than the local glazing fabrication industry.

4. Injury and causation

Section 269TAE of the *Customs Act 1901* requires that material injury be caused by the dumping or subsidisation, and that injury caused by other factors not be attributed to it. We submit that SEF 691 does not adequately separate these other factors:

- **Residential construction downturn** – dwelling approvals and commencements fell during the investigation period. Lower demand for windows and doors would have reduced the industry's volumes and prices regardless of imports.
- **Input and labour costs** – increases in aluminium, glass, energy and labour costs eroded the industry's feasibilities. These are not caused by imports – imports improve feasibility.
- **Builder insolvencies** – the high rate of builder failures reduced and delayed orders across the supply chain.
- **Capacity and lead times** – builders turned to imports where local suppliers could not meet volume, specification or delivery requirements, not because of price alone. We've found a lot of our projects require specialist dies which are not available local without casting new dies at large cost.
- **Negligible subsidy margins** – SEF 691 found subsidy margins of 0.7%–1.5% for cooperating exporters, all negligible. This weakens any finding that subsidisation contributed to injury.

We ask the Commissioner to quantify the effect of each factor and explain why the injury remaining after those factors are removed is material.

We also ask the Commissioner to consider the effect of measures on downstream users. Effective security rates of 5.3% to 73.3% will raise the cost of new housing at a time of acute supply shortage.