



OTTAWA, January 18, 2017

STATEMENT OF REASONS

**Concerning the preliminary determination
with respect to the dumping of**

**CERTAIN CONCRETE REINFORCING BAR
ORIGINATING IN OR EXPORTED FROM
THE REPUBLIC OF BELARUS, CHINESE TAIPEI, THE HONG KONG SPECIAL
ADMINISTRATIVE REGION OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, JAPAN,
THE PORTUGUESE REPUBLIC AND THE KINGDOM OF SPAIN**

DECISION

Pursuant to subsection 38(1) of the *Special Import Measures Act*, on January 3, 2017, the Canada Border Services Agency made a preliminary determination respecting the dumping of certain concrete reinforcing bar originating in or exported from the Republic of Belarus, Chinese Taipei, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, Japan, the Portuguese Republic and the Kingdom of Spain.

Cet Énoncé des motifs est également disponible en français.
This Statement of Reasons is also available in French.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY OF EVENTS	1
PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION	2
PROFITABILITY ANALYSIS PERIOD	2
INTERESTED PARTIES	2
COMPLAINANTS	2
OTHER PRODUCER	4
IMPORTERS	4
EXPORTERS	4
GOVERNMENT OF BELARUS	4
PRODUCT INFORMATION	5
PRODUCT DEFINITION	5
ADDITIONAL PRODUCT INFORMATION	5
PRODUCTION PROCESS	6
PRODUCT USE	7
CLASSIFICATION OF IMPORTS	7
LIKE GOODS AND CLASSES OF GOODS	7
THE CANADIAN INDUSTRY	7
IMPORTS INTO CANADA	8
INVESTIGATION PROCESS	8
DUMPING INVESTIGATION	9
NORMAL VALUE	9
EXPORT PRICE	10
MARGIN OF DUMPING	10
PRELIMINARY RESULTS OF THE DUMPING INVESTIGATION	10
BELARUS	10
CHINESE TAIPEI	13
HONG KONG	15
JAPAN	16
PORTUGAL	16
SPAIN	17
ALL OTHER EXPORTERS	18
REPRESENTATIONS	19
SUMMARY OF PRELIMINARY RESULTS	21
DECISION	22
PROVISIONAL DUTY	22
FUTURE ACTION	22
THE CANADA BORDER SERVICES AGENCY	22
THE CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRIBUNAL	23
RETROACTIVE DUTY ON MASSIVE IMPORTATIONS	23
UNDERTAKINGS	23
PUBLICATION	24
INFORMATION	24
APPENDIX – SUMMARY OF THE ESTIMATED MARGINS OF DUMPING AND PROVISIONAL DUTIES BY EXPORTER	25

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

[1] On June 30, 2016, AltaSteel Ltd. (AltaSteel) located in Edmonton, Alberta, ArcelorMittal Long Products Canada, g.p. (ArcelorMittal LCNA) located in Contrecoeur, Quebec and Gerdau Ameristeel Corporation (Gerdau) located in Whitby, Ontario (hereinafter the complainants) filed a complaint with the Canada Border Services Agency's (CBSA) Trade and Anti-dumping Programs Directorate alleging that imports into Canada of certain concrete reinforcing bar (rebar) originating in or exported from the Republic of Belarus (Belarus), Chinese Taipei, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (Hong Kong), Japan, the Portuguese Republic (Portugal) and the Kingdom of Spain (Spain) (hereinafter subject goods and named countries) are being dumped. The complainants alleged that the dumping has caused injury and is threatening to cause injury to the Canadian industry producing the like goods. The complaint was supported by Max Aicher North America Ltd. (MANA), a producer of rebar located in Hamilton, Ontario.

[2] On July 21, 2016, pursuant to paragraph 32(1)(a) of the *Special Import Measures Act* (SIMA), the CBSA informed the complainants that the complaint was properly documented. The CBSA also notified the governments of Belarus, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Portugal and Spain that a properly documented complaint had been received.

[3] The complainants provided evidence to support the allegations that rebar from Belarus, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Portugal and Spain has been dumped. The evidence also disclosed a reasonable indication that the dumping has caused injury and is threatening to cause injury to the Canadian industry producing the like goods.

[4] On August 19, 2016, pursuant to subsection 31(1) of SIMA, the CBSA initiated an investigation respecting the dumping of rebar from the named countries.

[5] Upon receiving notice of the initiation of the investigation, the Canadian International Trade Tribunal (CITT) commenced a preliminary injury inquiry, pursuant to subsection 34(2) of SIMA, into whether the evidence disclosed a reasonable indication that the alleged dumping of rebar from the named countries has caused injury or retardation or is threatening to cause injury to the domestic industry producing the like goods.

[6] On October 19, 2016, pursuant to subsection 37.1(1) of SIMA, the CITT made a preliminary determination that there was evidence that disclosed a reasonable indication that the dumping of certain concrete reinforcing bar originating in or exported from Belarus, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Portugal and Spain has caused injury or is threatening to cause injury to the domestic industry.

[7] On November 4, 2016, due to the complexity and novelty of the issues presented by the investigation, the CBSA extended the 90-day period for making the preliminary determination or terminating all or part of the investigation to 135 days pursuant to subsection 39(1) of SIMA.

[8] On November 7, 2016, the CBSA initiated a section 20 inquiry with respect to the rebar sector in Belarus.

[9] On January 3, 2017, as a result of the CBSA's preliminary investigation and pursuant to subsection 38(1) of SIMA, the CBSA made a preliminary determination of dumping respecting certain concrete reinforcing bar originating in or exported from Belarus, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Portugal and Spain.

[10] On January 3, 2017, pursuant to subsection 8(1) of SIMA, provisional duty was imposed on imports of goods that are of the same description as any goods to which the preliminary determination applies, and that are released during the period commencing on the day the preliminary determination was made and ending on the earlier of the day on which the CBSA causes the investigation to be terminated pursuant to subsection 41(1) of SIMA or the day the CITT makes an order or finding pursuant to subsection 43(1) of SIMA.

PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION

[11] The Period of Investigation (POI) with respect to the investigation covers all subject goods released into Canada from June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016.

PROFITABILITY ANALYSIS PERIOD

[12] The Profitability Analysis Period (PAP) covered domestic sales and costing information for goods sold from March 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016.

INTERESTED PARTIES

Complainants

[13] The complainants, AltaSteel, ArcelorMittal LCNA and Gerdau are the major producers of rebar in Canada. As such, the complainants account for a major proportion of the total domestic production of the like goods as defined in subsection 2(1) of SIMA.

[14] The names and addresses of the complainants are as follows:

AltaSteel Ltd.
9401 34 Street
Edmonton, Alberta
T6B 2X6

ArcelorMittal Long Products Canada, g.p.
4000 Routes des Acieries
Contrecoeur, Quebec
J0L 1C0

Gerdau Longsteel North America
Hopkins Street South
Whitby, Ontario
L1N 5T1

AltaSteel Ltd.

[15] The company now known as AltaSteel was founded in 1955. It has undergone various ownership changes and is now owned by Arrium Limited (previously known as OneSteel Limited).

[16] AltaSteel is a scrap-based mini-mill with melting and casting manufacturing facilities in Edmonton, Alberta. The company employs over 370 people. AltaSteel makes a variety of round, flat, and square bar shapes for use by downstream manufacturers in the mining, oil and gas, automotive, construction, agriculture and OEM industries.

ArcelorMittal Long Products Canada, g.p.

[17] ArcelorMittal LCNA is a subsidiary of ArcelorMittal and has eleven steel manufacturing facilities in Canada and the United States of America (U.S.). ArcelorMittal LCNA produces over 5 million metric tonnes (MT) per year and has 3,400 employees. It produces a range of products including rebar, billets, flats, and wire rod.

[18] ArcelorMittal LCNA operations in Canada produce 2.2 million MT per year and have 1,680 employees. These facilities produce billets and slabs as primary products. For value added products, it produces rebar, wire rod and downstream wire products, flat bar and round bar, and other products.

[19] ArcelorMittal LCNA has three rebar manufacturing facilities in the province of Quebec, the Contrecoeur East facility produces rebar in coil form while the Contrecoeur West and the Longueuil facilities produce cut-to-length rebar.

Gerdau Longsteel North America

[20] The parent company of Gerdau is Gerdau S.A of Brazil. Gerdau entered the North American market in 1989 with the acquisition of Courtice Steel in Cambridge, Ontario. In 1995, Gerdau acquired MRM Steel in Selkirk, Manitoba. In 2002, Gerdau merged its North American operations with Co-Steel of Whitby, Ontario, and the combined entity became Gerdau Ameristeel Corporation. Gerdau acquired 100% ownership of Gerdau Ameristeel in 2010. Gerdau now operates these three Canadian plants, as well as six American plants producing rebar, as Gerdau Longsteel North America, a division of Gerdau Ameristeel.

[21] Gerdau has manufacturing facilities in Whitby and Cambridge, Ontario and in Selkirk, Manitoba. Gerdau's three Canadian rebar-producing operations are capable of producing the full range of sizes and grades of rebar. The Whitby plant has produced straight rebar since 1964, as well as other bars and structural shapes. The Cambridge plant has produced straight rebar since 1986. It also produces rounds, squares, channels and angles. Gerdau MRM in Selkirk has produced rebar for over 75 years.

Other Producer

Max Aicher North America Ltd.

[22] MANA, another producer of rebar, is located in Hamilton, Ontario. MANA's bar mill produces both hot-rolled bar coils and cut bar lengths. MANA filed a letter in support of this complaint.¹

Importers

[23] At the initiation of the investigation, the CBSA identified 28 potential importers of the subject goods based on both information provided by the complainants and CBSA import entry documentation.

[24] The CBSA sent an Importer Request for Information (RFI) to all potential importers of the goods. The CBSA received five responses to the Importer RFI.

[25] Additionally, on November 7, 2016, these 28 potential importers were sent a Section 20 RFI in relation to their re-sales in Canada of imports of rebar from any non-named countries. Three importers² provided a response to the Section 20 RFI.

Exporters

[26] At the initiation of the investigation, the CBSA identified 64 potential exporters of the subject goods from information provided by the complainant and CBSA import entry documentation. The CBSA sent an Exporter RFI – Dumping (Dumping RFI) to each of the potential exporters. Ten exporters³ provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI.

[27] Additionally, as a result of the initiation of a section 20 inquiry, the known rebar producer/exporter in Belarus, OJSC Byelorussian Steel Works (BMZ), was sent a Section 20 RFI. A response to the Section 20 RFI was received from BMZ on December 12, 2016.

Government of Belarus

[28] As a result of the initiation of a section 20 inquiry, the CBSA sent a Section 20 RFI to the Government of Belarus. A response to the Section 20 RFI was received from the Government of Belarus on December 12, 2016.

¹ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – Certain Rebar Complaint, Confidential Attachment 6.

² Two of the respondents to the Section 20 RFI indicated that they did not import the Goods in Question from any country other than the named countries.

³ One response to the Dumping RFI was a joint submission by OJSC Byelorussian Steel Works and Bel Kap Steel LLC.

[29] The Government of Belarus refers to all levels of government, i.e., central, provincial, state, regional, city, economic or development zone, municipal, township, village, local, legislative, administrative or judicial, singular, collective, elected or appointed. It also includes any person, agency, enterprise, or institution acting for, on behalf of, or under the authority of, or under the authority of any law passed by, the government of that country or that provincial, state, municipal or other local or regional government.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

Product Definition

[30] For the purpose of this investigation, the subject goods are defined as:

Hot-rolled deformed steel concrete reinforcing bar in straight lengths or coils, commonly identified as rebar, in various diameters up to and including 56.4 millimeters, in various finishes, excluding plain round bar and fabricated rebar products, originating in or exported from the Republic of Belarus, Chinese Taipei, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, Japan, the Portuguese Republic and the Kingdom of Spain. Also excluded is 10 mm diameter (10M) rebar produced to meet the requirements of CSA G30 18.09 (or equivalent standards) that is coated to meet the requirements of epoxy standard ASTM A775/A 775M 04a (or equivalent standards) in lengths from 1 foot (30.48 cm) up to and including 8 feet (243.84 cm).

Additional Product Information

[31] For further clarity, the subject goods include all hot-rolled deformed bar, rolled from billet steel, rail steel, axle steel, low alloy-steel and other alloy steel that does not comply with the definition of stainless steel.

[32] Uncoated rebar, sometimes referred to as black rebar, is generally used for projects in non-corrosive environments where anti-corrosion coatings are not required. On the other hand, anti-corrosion coated rebar is used in concrete projects that are subjected to corrosive environments, such as road salt. Examples of anti-corrosion coated rebar are epoxy or hot-dip galvanized rebar. The subject goods include uncoated rebar and rebar that has a coating or finish applied.

[33] Fabricated rebar products are generally engineered using Computer Automated Design programs, and are made to the customer's unique project requirements. The fabricated rebar products are normally finished with either a protective or corrosion-resistant coating. Fabricated rebar is not included in the product definition of subject goods. Rebar that is simply cut-to-length is not considered to be a fabricated rebar product and it is included in the definition of the subject goods.

Production Process

[34] Deformed steel concrete reinforcing bar can be produced in an integrated steel production facility, or in a mini mill using ferrous scrap metal as the principal raw material. Scrap metal is melted in an electric arc furnace and is further processed in a ladle arc-refining unit. The molten steel is then continuously cast into rectangular billets of steel that are cut-to-length. An integrated facility would also produce billets from molten steel. The billets are then rolled into various sizes of rebar which are cut to various lengths depending on the customers' requirements.

[35] Deformed rebar is rolled with deformations on the bar which provides gripping power so that concrete adheres to the bar and provides reinforcing value. The deformations must conform to requirements set out in national standards.

[36] More specifically, rebar is produced in Canada in accordance with the National Standard of Canada CAN/CSA-G30.18-M92 for Billet-Steel Bars for Concrete Reinforcement (the "National Standard") published by the CSA Group and approved by the Standards Council of Canada.

[37] The following are the most common bar designation numbers for the subject goods in Canada, with the corresponding diameter in millimetres (mm) in brackets: 10 (11.3), 15 (16.0), 20 (19.5), 25 (25.2), 30 (29.9) and 35 (35.7). Rebar sizes are commonly referred to as the bar designation number combined with the letter "M". For example, 10M rebar is rebar with a bar designation number of 10 and a diameter of 11.3 mm. Other diameters may also be demanded, and other measurement systems employed. For example, Imperial measure #7 bar (approximately 22 mm) is a common designation used in the mine roofing industry.

[38] The National Standard identifies two grades of rebar, namely regular or "R" and weldable or "W". R grades are intended for general applications while W grades are used where welding, bending or ductility is of special concern. Welded rebar was a premium product for the domestic industry, reflecting the higher cost of alloy steel; however, since all imports have been weldable products, Canadian production has shifted to weldable as a standard product. Weldable rebar is substitutable for regular rebar in all applications, though the reverse does not hold.

[39] The National Standard also identifies yield strength levels of 300, 400, and 500. This number refers to the minimum yield strength and is measured in megapascal ("MPa"). The grade and yield strength of rebar is identified by combining yield strength number with grade. Regular rebar with a yield strength of 400 MPa is 400R, and 400W is weldable rebar with a yield strength of 400 MPa. Yield strength is measured with an extensometer in accordance with the requirements of section 9 of the National Standard.

[40] The standard lengths for rebar are 6 metres (20 feet), 12 metres (40 feet) and 18 metres (60 feet), although rebar can be cut and sold in other lengths as specified by customers, or sold in coils.

Product Use

[41] Rebar is used in a number of applications, the most common of which is construction. Rebar is most commonly used to reinforce concrete and masonry structures. It enhances the compressional and tensional strength of concrete and helps prevent the concrete from cracking during curing or following changes in temperature. Rebar is also known as “reinforcing steel bar”. Residential markets primarily use rebar in smaller sizes, while the heavy construction and fabrication markets use most of the larger sizes of rebar.

Classification of Imports

[42] Imports into Canada of the subject goods are normally classified under the Harmonized System (HS) classification numbers: 7213.10.00.00 and 7214.20.00.00. In some instances, imports of the subject goods may also be classified under the following HS classification numbers: 7215.90.00.90 and 7227.90.00.90.

[43] The listing of HS classification numbers is for convenience of reference only. Refer to the product definition for authoritative details regarding the subject goods.

LIKE GOODS AND CLASSES OF GOODS

[44] Subsection 2(1) of SIMA defines “like goods” in relation to any other goods, as goods that are identical in all respects to the other goods, or in the absence of identical goods, goods the uses and other characteristics of which closely resemble those of the other goods.

[45] Based on the CITT’s findings in past inquiries involving rebar, the CBSA is of the opinion that domestically produced rebar are like goods to the subject goods and the subject goods and like goods constitute only one class of goods.^{4 5 6}

THE CANADIAN INDUSTRY

[46] As previously stated, the complainants, AltaSteel, ArcelorMittal LCNA and Gerdau, account for a major proportion of all domestic production of the like goods in Canada.

[47] In addition to the complainants, there is one other domestic producer of rebar, MANA, who supports the complaint.

⁴ Canadian International Trade Tribunal: *Certain Concrete Reinforcing Bar Originating in or Exported from Cuba, Korea, and Turkey*, RR-2004-001, Order and Reasons (January 26, 2005) at para 61-62; *Certain Concrete Reinforcing Bar Originating in or Exported from Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, Chinese Taipei, and Ukraine*, NQ-2000-007, Statement of Reasons (June 15, 2000), pg. 9-10; *Certain Concrete Reinforcing Bar Originating in or Exported from the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Korea, and the Republic of Turkey*, NQ-2014-001, Finding and Reasons, paragraphs 38-47.

⁵ Canadian International Trade Tribunal: *Certain Concrete Reinforcing Bar Originating in or Exported from Indonesia, Japan, Latvia, Moldova, Poland, Chinese Taipei, and Ukraine*, NQ-2000-007, Statement of Reasons (June 15, 2000), pg. 9-10.

⁶ CITT Reasons Preliminary Injury Inquiry No. PI-2016-002, November 3, 2016, paras. 23 and 24.

IMPORTS INTO CANADA

[48] During the preliminary phase of the investigation, the CBSA refined the estimated volume of imports based on information from CBSA import entry documentation and information received from exporters and importers.

[49] The following table presents the CBSA's analysis of imports of rebar into Canada during the POI for purposes of the preliminary determination:

**Import Volumes of Rebar
(% of Quantity)**

Country	June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016
Belarus	8.7%
Chinese Taipei	14.4%
Hong Kong	5.8%
Japan	3.5%
Portugal	17.7%
Spain	10.5%
All Other Countries	39.3%
Total Imports	100.0%

INVESTIGATION PROCESS

[50] Regarding the dumping investigation, information was requested from all known and potential exporters, producers, vendors and importers, concerning shipments of rebar released into Canada during the dumping POI of June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016.

[51] Regarding the section 20 inquiry, information was requested from the known exporter/producer of rebar in Belarus and from the Government of Belarus. The Period of Analysis for purposes of determining whether the conditions set out in section 20 of SIMA prevailed in the rebar sector in Belarus was from June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016. As the investigation already included appropriate countries to serve as potential "surrogates", no additional producers in countries not named in this investigation were requested to provide information for purposes of determining normal values under paragraph 20(1)(c) of SIMA. Importers were requested to provide information respecting re-sales in Canada of like goods imported from a third country in order to gather information to determine normal values under paragraph 20(1)(d) of SIMA.

[52] Several parties requested an extension to respond to their respective RFIs. The CBSA reviewed each request in order to determine whether unforeseen circumstances or unusual burdens justified the granting of an extension and granted an extension where warranted.⁷ Where parties requested an extension and the reasons for making the request did not constitute unforeseen circumstances or unusual burdens, the CBSA did not grant the extension and informed the parties that it could not guarantee that submissions received after the RFI response deadline would be taken into consideration for purposes of the preliminary phase of the investigation.

[53] After reviewing the responses to the RFIs, Supplemental RFIs were sent to responding parties to clarify information provided in the submissions and request any additional information considered necessary for the dumping investigation.

[54] The preliminary determination is based on the information available to the CBSA at the time of the preliminary determination. During the final phase of the investigation, additional information may be obtained in Supplemental RFI responses and selected responding exporters may be verified on-site, the results of which will be incorporated into the CBSA's final decision, which must be made by April 3, 2017.

DUMPING INVESTIGATION

[55] The CBSA received substantially complete responses to the Dumping RFI from one exporter of subject goods in each of Belarus, Hong Kong, Japan and Portugal, four exporters in Chinese Taipei and two exporters in Spain.

[56] On December 12, 2016, the CBSA received responses to the Section 20 RFI from the Government of Belarus and from the producer/exporter, BMZ.

Normal Value

[57] Normal values are generally estimated based on the domestic selling prices of like goods in the country of export, in accordance with the methodology of section 15 of SIMA, or on the aggregate of the cost of production of the goods, a reasonable amount for administrative, selling and all other costs, plus a reasonable amount for profits, in accordance with the methodology of paragraph 19(b) of SIMA.

[58] In the case of a country where, in the opinion of the CBSA, the government of that country has a monopoly or substantial monopoly of its export trade, and the government of that country substantially determines domestic prices and there is sufficient reason to believe that the domestic prices are not substantially the same as they would be in a competitive market, the normal values are generally estimated on the basis of the methodology set out in section 20 of SIMA using either the selling prices or costs of like goods in a "surrogate" country.

⁷ Exhibit 39 (NC) – The extension request from Power Steel Co., Ltd. was granted as a result of the disruptive impact of Typhoon Meranti.

Export Price

[59] The export price of goods sold to importers in Canada is generally estimated pursuant to section 24 of SIMA based on the lesser of the adjusted exporter's sale price for the goods or the adjusted importer's purchase price. These prices are adjusted where necessary by deducting the costs, charges, expenses, duties and taxes resulting from the exportation of the goods as provided for in subparagraphs 24(a)(i) to 24(a)(iii) of SIMA.

Margin of Dumping

[60] The estimated margin of dumping by exporter is equal to the amount by which the total estimated normal value exceeds the total estimated export price of the goods, expressed as a percentage of the total estimated export price. All subject goods imported into Canada during the POI are included in the estimation of the margins of dumping of the goods. Where the total estimated normal value of the goods does not exceed the total estimated export price of the goods, the margin of dumping is zero.

Preliminary Results of the Dumping Investigation

[61] The preliminary results for each exporter who provided a response to the Dumping RFI, and where applicable the Section 20 RFI, are summarized below.

[62] A summary of the estimated margins of dumping and provisional duties by exporter are presented in a summary table in **Appendix 1** while the preliminary results for each of the named countries can be found in the table at the end of this section entitled Summary of Preliminary Results.

Belarus

Section 20 Inquiry

[63] Section 20 is a provision of SIMA that may be applied to determine the normal value of goods in a dumping investigation where certain conditions prevail in the domestic market of the exporting country. In accordance with paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA, it is applied where, in the opinion of the CBSA, the government of that country has a monopoly or substantial monopoly of its export trade, it substantially determines domestic prices and there is sufficient reason to believe that the domestic prices are not substantially the same as they would be in a competitive market.

[64] For purposes of a dumping investigation, the CBSA proceeds on the presumption that section 20 of SIMA is not applicable to the sector under investigation absent sufficient information to the contrary. The CBSA may form an opinion where there is sufficient information that the conditions set forth in paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA exist in the sector under investigation.

[65] Subsequent to the initiation of the dumping investigation and based on the information on the administrative record, the CBSA had reason to believe that the Government of Belarus has a monopoly or substantial monopoly of its export trade in the rebar sector, and that it substantially determines domestic prices in the rebar sector in Belarus and these prices are not substantially the same as they would be if they were determined in a competitive market. Accordingly, on November 7, 2016, the CBSA initiated a section 20 inquiry to examine the extent to which the conditions of paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA exist in the rebar sector in Belarus.

[66] On November 7, 2016, the CBSA sent section 20 RFIs to the Government of Belarus and to the known rebar producer/exporter in that country. At the initiation of the section 20 inquiry, it was decided that, in the eventuality that normal values would be determined in accordance with paragraph 20(1)(c) of SIMA using either the selling prices or costs of like goods in a “surrogate” country, there were appropriate countries to serve as potential “surrogates” already included as part of this dumping investigation. Importers were requested to provide information respecting re-sales in Canada of like goods imported from a third country in order to gather information to enable the determination of normal values under paragraph 20(1)(d) of SIMA.

[67] On December 12, 2016, the CBSA received a response to the Section 20 RFIs from the Government of Belarus and from BMZ, a producer/exporter located in Belarus. A Supplemental RFI was also sent to the Government of Belarus to gather additional information.

[68] During the final phase of the investigation, the CBSA will continue to review and analyze information relating to whether or not the conditions of paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA apply to the rebar sector in Belarus.

Preliminary Results of the Section 20 Inquiry

[69] Information on the administrative record for the investigation indicates that the Government of Belarus plays a significant role in the rebar sector in Belarus. Further, the only known producer of rebar in Belarus, BMZ, is wholly owned by the Government of Belarus. The CBSA has reason to believe that the Government of Belarus directly or indirectly controls BMZ, and thus, the sector.

[70] There is also information on the administrative record indicating that the Government of Belarus has an export monopoly or a substantial monopoly of its export trade of rebar.

[71] The CBSA has conducted a preliminary price trend analysis of rebar sold in other domestic markets and compared it to domestic selling prices of BMZ in Belarus. The analysis

indicates that prices in Belarus did not follow the same trend as in other countries during the PAP, where prices are believed to be determined under competitive market conditions.⁸

[72] For the purposes of the preliminary determination, it is the opinion of the CBSA that the conditions of paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA exist in the rebar sector in Belarus.

[73] During the final phase of the dumping investigation, the CBSA will continue the section 20 inquiry and further verify and analyze information. The CBSA may reaffirm its opinion that the conditions of paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA exist in the rebar sector as part of the final phase of the investigation, or conclude that the determination of normal values may be made using domestic selling prices and costs in Belarus.

OJSC Byelorussian Steel Works

[74] BMZ is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Belarus. During the POI, all of BMZ's export sales to Canada were made through a related company, Bel Kap Steel LLC (Bel Kap), a vendor of subject goods located in the U.S.

[75] BMZ's head office is located in Zhlobin, Belarus. BMZ provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. A Supplemental RFI was sent to BMZ to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. BMZ also provided a response to the Section 20 RFI. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information from BMZ during the final phase of the investigation.

[76] For purposes of the preliminary determination, normal values for BMZ could not be estimated on the basis of domestic selling prices in Belarus or on the full cost of goods plus profit because the CBSA has formed the opinion that the conditions of paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA exist in the rebar sector in Belarus. Accordingly, the CBSA may estimate normal values using the selling price, or the total cost and profit, of like goods sold by producers in a surrogate country, pursuant to paragraph 20(1)(c) of SIMA. There was sufficient information to estimate normal values using the methodology of subparagraph 20(1)(c)(i) of SIMA, with Chinese Taipei designated as the surrogate country. Therefore, normal values for BMZ were estimated using the weighted average of the estimated normal values from the producers in Chinese Taipei.

[77] For the subject goods exported from BMZ to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[78] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 19.8% for BMZ, expressed as a percentage of export price.

⁸ Exhibit 250 (PRO).

Chinese Taipei

Feng Hsin Steel Co., Ltd.

[79] Feng Hsin Steel Co., Ltd. (Feng Hsin) is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Chinese Taipei.

[80] Feng Hsin's head office is located in Taichung, Chinese Taipei. Feng Hsin provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Three Supplemental RFIs were sent to Feng Hsin to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their responses. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information from Feng Hsin during the final phase of the investigation.

[81] Feng Hsin had a sufficient number of domestic sales of like goods during the PAP. Consequently, all normal values were estimated using the methodology of section 15 of SIMA based on domestic selling prices of like goods.

[82] For the subject goods exported from Feng Hsin to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[83] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 1.0% for Feng Hsin, expressed as a percentage of export price.

Lo-Toun Steel & Iron Works Co., Ltd.

[84] Lo-Toun Steel & Iron Works Co., Ltd. (Lo-Toun) is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Chinese Taipei.

[85] Lo-Toun's head office is located in Yilan County, Chinese Taipei. Lo-Toun provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Four Supplemental RFIs were sent to Lo-Toun to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information submitted from Lo-Toun during the final phase of the investigation.

[86] Lo-Toun had a sufficient number of domestic sales of like goods during the PAP. Consequently, all normal values were estimated using the methodology of section 15 of SIMA based on domestic selling prices of like goods.

[87] For the subject goods exported from Lo-Toun to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[88] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 9.9% for Lo-Toun, expressed as a percentage of export price.

Power Steel Co., Ltd.

[89] Power Steel Co., Ltd. (Power Steel) is a producer and an exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Chinese Taipei.

[90] Power Steel's head office is located in Kaohsiung, Chinese Taipei. Power Steel provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Three Supplemental RFIs were sent to Power Steel to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. However, the CBSA's analysis of the information revealed inconsistencies in certain information pertaining to domestic sales, export sales and costing and the CBSA was unable to reconcile the information. Consequently, the CBSA was unable to estimate Power Steel's margin of dumping on the basis of their submission for the purposes of the preliminary determination.

[91] The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information submitted by Power Steel and will afford Power Steel the opportunity to address inconsistencies in their submitted information during the final phase of the investigation.

[92] Given that the CBSA is unable to use Power Steel's information to estimate a margin of dumping for the purposes of the preliminary determination, the normal values and export prices were estimated using the methodologies explained in the section below entitled "All Other Exporters". Based on these methodologies, the estimated margin of dumping for Power Steel is 109.2%, expressed as a percentage of the export price.

Tung Ho Steel Enterprise Corporation

[93] Tung Ho Steel Enterprise Corporation (Tung Ho) is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Chinese Taipei.

[94] Tung Ho's head office is located in Taipei City, Chinese Taipei. Tung Ho provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Three Supplemental RFIs were sent to Tung Ho to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information from Tung Ho during the final phase of the investigation.

[95] Tung Ho had domestic sales of like goods during the PAP. Where there were sufficient domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated using the methodology of section 15 of SIMA. Where there were insufficient domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated using the methodology of paragraph 19(b) of SIMA, based on the aggregate of the cost of production of the goods, a reasonable amount for administrative, selling and all other costs, and a reasonable amount for profits.

[96] In this regard, the amount for profits was estimated in accordance with subparagraph 11(1)(b)(ii) of the *Special Import Measures Regulation* (SIMR) based on Tung Ho's domestic sales of goods that were of the same general category as the subject goods exported to Canada during the POI.

[97] For the subject goods exported from Tung Ho to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[98] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 0% for Tung Ho, expressed as a percentage of export price.

Hong Kong

Shiu Wing Steel Limited

[99] Shiu Wing Steel Limited (Shiu Wing) is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Hong Kong.

[100] Shiu Wing's head office is located in central Hong Kong. Shiu Wing provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Two Supplemental RFIs were sent to Shiu Wing to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information from Shiu Wing during the final phase of the investigation.

[101] Shiu Wing had domestic sales of like goods during the PAP. Where there were sufficient domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated using the methodology of section 15 of SIMA. Where there were insufficient domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated using the methodology of paragraph 19(b) of SIMA, based on the aggregate of the cost of production of the goods, a reasonable amount for administrative, selling and all other costs, and a reasonable amount for profits.

[102] In this regard, the amount for profits was estimated in accordance with subparagraph 11(1)(b)(ii) of the SIMR based on Shiu Wing's domestic sales of goods that were of the same general category as the subject goods exported to Canada during the POI.

[103] For the subject goods exported from Shiu Wing to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[104] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 53.3% for Shiu Wing, expressed as a percentage of export price.

Japan

Marubeni-Itochu Steel Inc.

[105] Marubeni-Itochu Steel Inc. (MISI) is a trading house and an exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Japan. During the POI, MISI purchased the subject goods it exported to Canada from three rebar mills located in Japan: Chiyoda Steel Co., Ltd., Jonan Steel Corporation and Sanko Seiko Co., Ltd.

[106] MISI's head office is located in Tokyo, Japan. MISI provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Two Supplemental RFIs were sent to MISI to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. However, during the preliminary phase of the investigation, the manufacturers of the subject goods did not respond to the Dumping RFI. As a result, the CBSA was unable to estimate MISI's margin of dumping on the basis of their submission for the purposes of the preliminary determination.

[107] To the extent that the manufacturers provide a complete response to the Dumping RFI and that the CBSA has sufficient time to analyse and verify the information from MISI and the manufacturers during the final phase of the investigation, the CBSA may use the information for the purposes of the final decision.

[108] Given that the CBSA is unable to use MISI's information to estimate a margin of dumping for the purposes of the preliminary determination, the normal values and export prices were estimated using the methodologies explained in the section below entitled "All Other Exporters". Based on these methodologies, the estimated margin of dumping for MISI is 109.2%, expressed as a percentage of the export price.

Portugal

Metalurgica Galaica, S.A.

[109] Metalurgica Galaica, S.A. (MEGASA) is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Portugal.

[110] MEGASA's head office is located in Naron, Spain with production facilities in Portugal. MEGASA provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Three Supplemental RFIs were sent to MEGASA to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information from MEGASA during the final phase of the investigation.

[111] MEGASA had domestic sales of like goods during the PAP. Where there were sufficient domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated using the methodology of section 15 of SIMA. Where there were no domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated using the methodology of paragraph 19(b) of SIMA, based on the aggregate of the cost of production of the goods, a reasonable amount for administrative, selling and all other costs, and a reasonable amount for profits.

[112] In this regard, the amount for profits was estimated in accordance with subparagraph 11(1)(b)(ii) of the SIMR based on MEGASA's domestic sales of goods that were of the same general category as the subject goods exported to Canada during the POI.

[113] For the subject goods exported from MEGASA to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[114] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 2.2% for MEGASA, expressed as a percentage of export price.

Spain

Celsa Atlantic, S.L.

[115] Celsa Atlantic, S.L. (Celsa Atlantic) is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Spain.

[116] Celsa Atlantic's head office is located in Castellbisbal, Spain. Celsa Atlantic provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Three Supplemental RFIs were sent to Celsa Atlantic to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information from Celsa Atlantic during the final phase of the investigation.

[117] Celsa Atlantic had domestic sales of like goods during the PAP. Where there were sufficient domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated using the methodology of section 15 of SIMA. Where there were insufficient domestic sales of like goods, normal values were estimated based on the methodology of paragraph 19(b) of SIMA, based on the aggregate of the cost of production of the goods, a reasonable amount for administrative, selling and all other costs, and a reasonable amount for profits.

[118] In this regard, the amount for profits was estimated in accordance with subparagraph 11(1)(b)(ii) of the SIMR based on Celsa Atlantic's domestic sales of goods that were of the same general category as the subject goods exported to Canada during the POI.

[119] For the subject goods exported from Celsa Atlantic to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[120] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 15.8% for Celsa Atlantic, expressed as a percentage of export price.

Nervacero S.A.

[121] Nervacero S.A. (Nervacero) is a producer and exporter of the subject goods to Canada from Spain.

[122] Nervacero's head office is located in Barcelona, Spain. Nervacero provided a substantially complete response to the Dumping RFI. Two Supplemental RFIs were sent to Nervacero to gather additional information and seek clarification regarding their original RFI response. The CBSA will continue to collect and verify information from Nervacero during the final phase of the investigation.

[123] Nervacero had a sufficient number of domestic sales of like goods during the PAP. Consequently, all normal values were estimated using the methodology of section 15 of SIMA based on domestic selling prices of like goods.

[124] For the subject goods exported from Nervacero to Canada during the POI, export prices were estimated using the methodology of section 24 of SIMA, based on the exporter's selling price less all costs, charges and expenses resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[125] For the preliminary determination, the total estimated normal value compared with the total estimated export price results in an estimated margin of dumping of 32.5% for Nervacero, expressed as a percentage of export price.

All Other Exporters

[126] At the initiation of the investigation, all known and potential exporters in the named countries were sent a Dumping RFI in order to solicit information required for purposes of determining normal values and export prices of the subject goods in accordance with the provisions of SIMA. As such, all exporters were given the opportunity to participate in the investigation. In the Dumping RFI, the exporters were notified that failure to submit all required information and documentation, including non-confidential versions, or failure to permit verification of any information, may result in the normal values of the subject goods exported by their company being based on the facts available. It was further stated that such a decision would be less favourable to their company than if complete and verifiable information were made available.

[127] For exporters that did not provide a response or where sufficient information was not provided in response to the Dumping RFI, normal values and export prices were estimated on the basis of facts available. In establishing the methodologies for determining these estimates, the CBSA examined all information on the record, including information from the complaint, information provided by exporters, publically available information and customs documentation.

[128] The CBSA considered that the normal values and export prices estimated for the responding exporters, rather than the information provided in the complaint, was the best information on which to base the methodology for estimating normal values. The CBSA examined the difference between the estimated normal value and estimated export price of each individual transaction for the responding exporters in order to obtain an appropriate amount for the normal value methodology. The transactions were also examined to ensure that anomalies were not considered, however, no anomalies were identified.

[129] The CBSA considered that the highest amount by which the estimated normal value exceeded the estimated export price found on an individual transaction (expressed as a percentage of the export price) was an appropriate basis for estimating normal values. This method of estimating normal values was based on information on the record and limits the advantage that an exporter may gain from not providing necessary information requested in a dumping investigation as compared to an exporter that did provide the necessary information.

[130] Therefore, the normal values were estimated based on the estimated export price, plus an amount equal to 109.2% of that estimated export price.

[131] The CBSA considered that the information submitted on the CBSA customs entry documentation was the best information on which to estimate the export price of the goods as it reflects actual import data.

[132] Based on the above methodology, the estimated margin of dumping for the subject goods exported to Canada by all other exporters is 109.2%, expressed as a percentage of the export price.

Representations

[133] On October 24, 2016, three rebar mills in Japan, Chiyoda Steel Co., Ltd., Jonan Steel Corporation and Sanko Seiko Co., Ltd. made submissions indicating that the volume of imports of rebar into Canada from Japan during the POI may be negligible.⁹

[134] The volume of goods of a country would be considered negligible if it accounted for less than 3% of the total volume of goods of the same description imported into Canada from all countries, as defined in subsection 2(1) of SIMA. The CBSA's analysis of imports into Canada during the POI reveals that the import volume of rebar from Japan represents 3.5% of the total volume of rebar imported into Canada from all countries and this volume is not negligible.

⁹ Exhibits 139 (NC), 140 (NC) and 141 (NC).

[135] On November 1, 2016, the CBSA received representations from the Trade and Industry Department of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (Government of Hong Kong) with respect to the adequacy of the information contained in the complaint that resulted in the initiation of the dumping investigation on rebar with respect to Hong Kong. As such, the Government of Hong Kong requested that the CBSA terminate its dumping investigation on rebar with respect to Hong Kong.¹⁰

[136] The CBSA was satisfied that the complaint received on June 30, 2016 met the properly documented complaint requirements pursuant to subsection 2(1) of SIMA.

[137] Based on information provided in the complaint, in combination with the research and analysis conducted by the CBSA, the CBSA was of the opinion that there was evidence that rebar from Hong Kong has been dumped, and there was a reasonable indication that such dumping had caused and was threatening to cause injury to the Canadian industry. As a result, a dumping investigation was initiated under subsection 31(1) of SIMA on August 19, 2016.

[138] Counsel for the complainants provided comments to the CBSA concerning the Dumping RFI responses submitted by exporters.¹¹ The comments identified deficiencies pertaining to the specific responses and made suggestions regarding further information that could be sought by way of Supplemental RFIs and possible on-site verifications.

[139] The CBSA will take these comments into consideration when developing any further Supplemental RFIs and on-site verification questions during the final phase of the investigation.

[140] On December 15, 2016, counsel for BMZ and Bel Kap made submissions regarding the background and application of section 20 of SIMA.¹² The submission concluded that the conditions necessary to support an affirmative finding under paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA are not present in this investigation with respect to the rebar sector in Belarus.

[141] For the purposes of the preliminary determination, the CBSA is of the opinion that there is sufficient evidence that the conditions of paragraph 20(1)(b) of SIMA exist in the rebar sector in Belarus. The CBSA will continue to review and analyze information during the final phase of the dumping investigation.

¹⁰ Exhibit 182 (NC).

¹¹ Exhibits: 95 (PRO), 96 (NC), 97 (PRO), 98 (NC), 99 (NC), 100 (PRO), 103 (PRO), 104 (NC), 111 (PRO), 112 (NC), 113 (PRO), 114 (NC), 116 (PRO), 117 (NC), 122 (PRO), 123 (NC), 267 (PRO) and 268 (NC).

¹² Exhibits 236 (PRO) and 237 (NC).

Summary of Preliminary Results

[142] A summary of the preliminary results of the dumping investigation respecting all subject goods released into Canada during the POI follows:

Summary of Preliminary Results
Period of Investigation (June 1, 2015 to May 31, 2016)

Country	Estimated Margin of Dumping*	Estimated Volume of Subject Goods as Percentage of Total Imports
Belarus	19.8%	8.7%
Chinese Taipei	91.3%	14.4%
Hong Kong	53.3%	5.8%
Japan	109.2%	3.5%
Portugal	2.2%	17.7%
Spain	25.0%	10.5%

* Expressed as a percentage of the export price.

[143] Under section 35 of SIMA, if, at any time before making a preliminary determination the CBSA is satisfied that the actual and potential volume of goods of a country is negligible, the CBSA is required to terminate the investigation with respect to goods of that country.

[144] Pursuant to subsection 2(1) of SIMA, the volume of goods of a country is considered negligible if it accounts for less than 3% of the total volume of goods that are released into Canada from all countries that are of the same description as the goods.

[145] The volume of subject goods from each of the named countries is above 3% of the total volume of goods released into Canada from all countries. Based on the definition above, the volume of subject goods from the each of the named countries is not negligible.

[146] If, in making a preliminary determination, the CBSA determines that the margin of dumping of the goods of a country is insignificant pursuant to section 38 of SIMA, the investigation will continue in respect of those goods but provisional duties will not be imposed on goods of the same description imported during the provisional period.

[147] Pursuant to subsection 2(1) of SIMA, a margin of dumping of less than 2% of the export price of the goods is defined as insignificant. In this case, the margin of dumping, estimated for each of the named countries, is greater than the threshold of 2% and is therefore not considered insignificant.

DECISION

[148] On January 3, 2017, pursuant to subsection 38(1) of SIMA, the CBSA made a preliminary determination of dumping respecting certain concrete reinforcing bar originating in or exported from Belarus, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Portugal and Spain.

PROVISIONAL DUTY

[149] Pursuant to subsection 8(1) of SIMA, provisional duty payable by the importer in Canada will be applied to subject imports of rebar board that are released during the period commencing on the day the preliminary determination is made and ending on the earlier of the day on which the CBSA causes the investigation to be terminated, in accordance with subsection 41(1) of SIMA, or the day on which the CITT makes an order or finding. The CBSA considers that the imposition of provisional duty is needed to prevent injury. As noted in the CITT's preliminary determination, there is evidence that discloses a reasonable indication that the dumping of certain concrete reinforcing bar has caused injury or is threatening to cause injury to the domestic industry.

[150] Provisional duty is based on the estimated margin of dumping, expressed as a percentage of the export price of the goods. **Appendix 1** contains the estimated margins of dumping and the rates of provisional duty payable on subject goods released from the CBSA on and after January 3, 2017.

[151] Importers are required to pay provisional duty in cash or by certified cheque. Alternatively, they may post security equal to the amount payable. Importers should contact their CBSA regional office if they require further information on the payment of provisional duty or the posting of security. If the importers of such goods do not indicate the required SIMA code or do not correctly describe the goods in the import documents, an administrative monetary penalty could be imposed. The imported goods are also subject to the *Customs Act*. As a result, failure to pay duties within the specified time will result in the application of the provisions of the *Customs Act* regarding interest.

FUTURE ACTION

The Canada Border Services Agency

[152] The CBSA will continue its dumping investigation and will make a final decision by April 3, 2017.

[153] If the CBSA is satisfied that the goods were dumped and that the margin of dumping is not insignificant, a final determination will be made. Otherwise, the CBSA will terminate the investigation and any provisional duty paid or security posted, will be refunded to the importers.

The Canadian International Trade Tribunal

[154] The CITT has begun its inquiry into the question of injury to the domestic industry. The CITT is expected to issue its finding by May 3, 2017.

[155] If the CITT finds that the dumping has not caused injury, retardation or is not threatening to cause injury, the proceeding will be terminated and all provisional duty collected or security posted will be refunded.

[156] If the CITT makes a finding that the dumping has caused injury, retardation or is threatening to cause injury, anti-dumping duty in an amount equal to the margin of dumping will be levied, collected and paid on imports of certain concrete reinforcing bar in Canada.

[157] For purposes of the preliminary determination of dumping, the CBSA is responsible for determining whether the actual and potential volume of goods is negligible. After the preliminary determination of dumping, in accordance with subsection 42(4.1) of SIMA, the CITT is required to terminate its inquiry in respect of any goods if the CITT determines that the volume of dumped goods from a country is negligible.

RETROACTIVE DUTY ON MASSIVE IMPORTATIONS

[158] Under certain circumstances, anti-dumping duty can be imposed retroactively on subject goods imported into Canada. When the CITT conducts its inquiry on material injury to the domestic industry, it may consider if dumped goods that were imported close to or after the initiation of the investigation constitute massive importations over a relatively short period of time and have caused injury to the domestic industry. Should the CITT issue a finding that there were recent massive importations of dumped goods that caused injury, imports of subject goods released by the CBSA in the 90 days preceding the day of the preliminary determination could be subject to anti-dumping duty.

UNDERTAKINGS

[159] After a preliminary determination of dumping, other than a preliminary determination in which a determination was made that the margin of dumping is insignificant, exporters may give a written undertaking to revise selling prices to Canada so that the margin of dumping or the injury caused by the dumping is eliminated.

[160] Acceptable undertakings must account for all or substantially all of the exports to Canada of the dumped goods. In the event that an undertaking is accepted, the required payment of provisional duty on the goods would be suspended.

[161] In view of the time needed for consideration of undertakings, written undertaking proposals should be made as early as possible and no later than 60 days after the preliminary determination. Further details regarding undertakings can be found in the CBSA's Memorandum D14-1-9, available online at: <http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/publications/dm-md/d14/d14-1-9-eng.html>.

[162] SIMA allows all interested parties to make representations concerning any undertaking proposals. The CBSA will maintain a list of interested parties and will notify them should an undertaking proposal be received. Persons wishing to be notified must provide their name, address, telephone, fax, or email address, to one of the officers listed below. Interested parties may also consult the CBSA website noted below for information on undertakings offered in this investigation. A notice will be posted on the CBSA website when an undertaking proposal is received. Interested parties have nine days from the date the undertaking offer is received to make representations.

PUBLICATION

[163] A notice of this preliminary determination of dumping will be published in the *Canada Gazette* pursuant to paragraph 38(3)(a) of SIMA.

INFORMATION

[164] This *Statement of Reasons* has been provided to persons directly interested in this proceeding. It is also posted on the CBSA's website at the address below. For further information, please contact the officers identified as follows:

Mail:	SIMA Registry and Disclosure Unit Trade and Anti-dumping Programs Directorate Canada Border Services Agency 100 Metcalfe Street, 11 th floor Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0L8 Canada	
Telephone:	Robert Wright:	613-954-1643
	Joël Joyal:	613-954-7173
	Paul Pomnikow:	613-948-7809
E-mail:	simaregistry@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca	
Website:	http://www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/sima-lmsi/menu-eng.html	



Brent McRoberts
Director General
Trade and Anti-dumping Programs Directorate

ATTACHMENT

1. Summary of estimated margins of dumping and provisional duties by exporter

**APPENDIX – SUMMARY OF THE ESTIMATED MARGINS OF DUMPING AND
PROVISIONAL DUTIES BY EXPORTER**

The following table lists the estimated margins of dumping and the provisional duties payable by exporter as a result of the decision mentioned above. Imports of subject goods released from the Canada Border Services Agency, on or after January 3, 2017, will be subject to provisional duties at the rates specified below:

Exporter	Estimated Margins of Dumping/Provisional Duties Payable*
Belarus	
OJSC Byelorussian Steel Works	19.8%
Chinese Taipei	
Feng Hsin Steel Co., Ltd.	1.0%
Lo-Toun Steel & Iron Works Co., Ltd.	9.9%
Power Steel Co., Ltd.	109.2%
Tung Ho Steel Enterprise Corp.	0%
Hong Kong	
Shiu Wing Steel Limited	53.3%
Japan	
Marubeni-Itochu Steel Inc.	109.2%
Portugal	
Metalurgica Galaica, S.A.	2.2%
Spain	
Celsa Atlantic, S.L.	15.8%
Nervacero S.A.	32.5%
All Other Exporters	109.2%

* As a percentage of export price.