

### **Government of Pakistan National Tariff Commission**

**Report** 

On

#### **Conclusion of**

Sunset Review of Anti-Dumping Duties Imposed on Dumped Imports of Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets into Pakistan Originating in and/ or Exported from Canada and the Russian Federation

A.D.C No. 55/2019/NTC/CRC/SSR/2023 March 14, 2025

#### A. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

The National Tariff Commission (the "Commission") having regard to the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 (the "Agreement on Anti-dumping"), Anti-Dumping Duties Act, 2015 (the "Act") and the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules, 2022 (the "Rules") relating to the investigation/ review and determination of dumping of goods into the Islamic Republic of Pakistan ("Pakistan"), material injury to the domestic industry caused by such imports, and imposition of anti-dumping duties to offset the impact of such injurious dumping, and to ensure fair competition thereof. Section 58 of the Act relates to review of anti-dumping duties imposed on dumped imports of the investigated products.

- 2. Having regard to Section 58(3) of the Act, a definitive anti-dumping duty shall not expire if the Commission determines in a review that the expiry of such an anti-dumping duty would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury.
- 3. The Commission has conducted a sunset review of anti-dumping duty imposed on Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets ("CR Coils/Sheets") into Pakistan originating in and/or exported from Canada and the Russian Federation (the "Exporting Countries") under the Act and the Rules. This report on conclusion of the review has been issued in accordance with Section 39(5) of the Act and Article 12.2 of the Agreement on Anti-dumping.
- 4. In terms of Section 62(2) of the Act, the sunset review under Section 58 of the Act shall normally be completed within twelve months from its initiation. The sunset review was initiated on March 18, 2024.

#### B. BACKGROUND

#### 5. Anti-dumping Duties in Place

- 5.1 The Commission imposed definitive anti-dumping duty at the rate of 13.94 percent in *ad valorem* terms on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries for a period of five years effective from September 20, 2019.
- 5.2 The Commission has also conducted anti-dumping investigations on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from other sources at the request of the Applicants and has imposed the following definitive anti-dumping duties on imports of CR Coils/Sheets for five years:

Table-I

Definitive Anti-dumping Duties Imposed on CR Coils/Sheets

| Country Name           | Duty Rate (%)  | Effective from    | Current status                          |
|------------------------|----------------|-------------------|---|
| (1)                    | (2)            | (3)               | (4)                                     |
| The Russian Federation | 13.94          | 20 September 2019 | Duty in place                           |
| Canada                 | 13.94          | 20 September 2019 | Duty in place                           |
| China                  | 13.17 to 19.04 |                   | Duty in place                           |
| Ukraine                | 18.36 & 18.92  | 13 January 2016   | Duty terminated<br>after SSR in<br>2021 |
| Chinese Taipei         | 6.18           |                   | Duty in place                           |
| European Union         | 6.50           | 03 February 2022  | Duty in place                           |
| South Korea            | 13.24          | 00 i Colualy 2022 | Duty in place                           |
| Vietnam                | 17.25          |                   | Duty in place                           |

#### C. PROCEDURE

6. The procedure set out below has been followed with regard to this sunset review in accordance with relevant provisions of the Act.

#### 7. Notice of Impending Expiry of Definitive Anti-dumping Duty

In terms of Section 58(3) of the Act, a definitive anti-dumping duty shall not expire if the Commission determines in a review initiated before expiry of anti-dumping duty that the expiry of such anti-dumping duty would be likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping of the investigated product and injury to the domestic industry. Further, the anti-dumping duty shall remain in force pending the outcome of such a review. The Commission published a notice of impeding expiry of the anti-dumping duty in this case in the official Gazette and national press in accordance with Section 58 (2) of the Act on October 09, 2023.

#### 8. Receipt of Application

The Commission received an application on November 22, 2023, under Section 58 of the Act for review of the anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries. The application was filed by M/s Aisha Steel Mills Limited, Karachi and M/s International Steel Limited, Karachi (the "Applicants"), who are domestic producers of CR Coils/Sheets. The application was in response to the notice of impending expiry of the anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets into Pakistan originating in and /or exported from the Exporting Countries. The Applicants contended that expiry of anti-dumping duty on CR Coils/Sheets would likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries and injury to the domestic industry producing CR Coils/Sheets.

#### 9. <u>Evaluation and Examination of the Application</u>

Examination of the application showed that it met the requirements of Section 58(3) of the Act and Rule 32 of the Rules as it contained sufficient evidence of likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries and injury to the domestic industry.

#### 10. **Domestic Industry**

- 10.1 According to the information available with the Commission, the domestic industry producing CR Coils/Sheets consists of the following six (06) units with an operational capacity of around 1,500,000 MT per annum. The Applicants' total installed capacity is 950,000 MT per annum. Pakistan Steel Mills Limited listed at S. No. vi, is not in operation since the year 2015.
  - i. Aisha Steel Mills Limited ("ASL"), Karachi;
  - ii. International Steel Limited ("ISL"), Karachi;
  - iii. AHN Steel Pvt. Limited, Lahore;
  - iv. MAB Steel Industries (Pvt.) Limited, Rawalpindi;
  - v. Hadeed Pakistan (Pvt.) Limited, Lahore, and
  - vi. Pakistan Steel Mills Limited, Karachi
- 10.2 Following table shows unit-wise installed capacity of the domestic industry:

Table-II
Unit-wise Installed Production Capacity (MT)

| one mountaine readenen eapasity |                             |           |  |  |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--|--|
| S. No.                          | Unit Name                   | Installed |  |  |
| S. 140.                         | Onit ivairie                | Capacity* |  |  |
| i.                              | Aisha Steel Mills Limited   | 33.4      |  |  |
| ii.                             | International Steel Limited | 30.0      |  |  |
| iii.                            | AHN Steel                   | 3.3       |  |  |
| iv.                             | MAB Steel                   | 13.3      |  |  |
| ٧.                              | Hadeed Pakistan             | 20.0      |  |  |
|                                 | Total                       | 100.0     |  |  |

<sup>\*</sup>Installed capacity is determined on the basis of CR coils of 0.5/0.6 mm thickness on triple shift basis

Sources: the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed

w.r.t. figure of total installed capacity by taking it equal to 100.

#### 11. Standing of the Application

11.1 The application fulfils the requirements of Section 24 of the Act, which require the Commission to assess the standing of the domestic industry on basis of the degree of support for or opposition to the application expressed by the domestic producers of the like product.

- 11.2 In terms of Section 24(1) of the Act, an application shall be considered to have been made by or on behalf of the domestic industry only if it is supported by those domestic producers whose collective output constitutes more than fifty percent of the total production of a domestic like product produced by that portion of the domestic industry expressing either support for or opposition to the application. Furthermore, Section 24(2) of the Act provides that no investigation shall be initiated when domestic producers expressly supporting an application account for less than twenty five percent of the total production of domestic like product produced by the domestic industry.
- 11.3 The application was filed by the M/s Aisha Steel Mills Limited, Karachi and M/s International Steel Limited, Karachi, who are the major producers of CR Coils/Sheets in Pakistan. The Applicants produced 84.79 percent of the total domestic production during October 01, 2022, to September 30, 2023, whereas the other units in the industry are indifferent. Therefore, the application is considered to have been filed by the domestic industry, as it is supported by those domestic producers whose collective production constitutes 84.79 percent of the total production of the like product. The following table shows the standing of the application as per Section 24 of the Act:

Table-III
Standing of Application

| Standing of Application           |                               |             |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Unit Name                         | Share in total production (%) | Status      |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1)                               | (2)                           | (3)         |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aisha Steel Mills Limited         | 20.66                         | Applicant   |  |  |  |  |  |
| International Steel Limited       | 64.13                         | Applicant   |  |  |  |  |  |
| AHN Steel Pvt. Limited            | 1.52                          | Indifferent |  |  |  |  |  |
| MAB Steel Industries Pvt. Limited | 2.10                          | Indifferent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hadeed Pakistan Pvt. Limited      | 11.59                         | Indifferent |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total                             | 100.00                        |             |  |  |  |  |  |

Source: the Applicants

11.4 On the basis of the above information and analysis it is determined that the application is made on behalf of the domestic industry as it fulfils the requirements of Section 24 of the Act.

#### 12. <u>Initiation of Sunset Review</u>

12.1 Upon examination of the application, the Commission established that it met the requirements of Section 58 of the Act and Rule 32 of the Rules. Therefore, the Commission initiated sunset review on March 18, 2024, to determine whether there is likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries and injury to the domestic industry.

- 12.2 In terms of Section 27 of the Act, the Commission issued a notice of initiation of the sunset review of anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries, which was published in the official Gazette of Pakistan and in two widely circulated national newspapers ("The Nation" and "Daily Express") on March 18, 2024.
- 12.3 The Commission notified the High Commission of Canada and Embassy of the Russian Federation in Pakistan on March 20, 2024, of the initiation of the sunset review by sending a copy of the notice of initiation with a request to forward it to all exporters/producers involved in production, sales and export of CR Coils/Sheets in Canada and Russian Federation. Copies of notice of initiation were also sent to the Applicants, known exporters/producers of CR Coils/Sheets in Canada and Russian Federation (whose addresses were available with the Commission), known importers and domestic producers on March 20, 2024, in accordance with the requirements of Section 27 of the Act.
- 12.4 In accordance with Section 28 of the Act, on March 20, 2024, the Commission also sent copy of full text of the written application (non-confidential version) to all known exporters/producers of CR Coils/Sheets in Canada and Russian Federation, whose addresses were available with the Commission and to the High Commission of Canada and Embassy of the Russian Federation in Islamabad with a request to forward it to all exporters /producers of CR Coils/Sheets involved in production, sale and/or export of product under review.

#### 13. **Product under Review**

- 13.1 12.1.1 In the original investigation the investigated product was defined as follows: "flat-rolled products of iron or non- alloy steel, cold rolled (cold- reduced), not clad, plated or coated ("CR Coils/Sheets/Strips"), of prime and secondary quality, of a thickness ranging from 0.15 mm to 3.00 mm, originating in and/or exported from the Exporting Countries to Pakistan. It is classified under Pakistan Customs Tariff Heading Nos. 7209.1510, 7209.1590, 7209.1610, 7209.1690, 7209.1710, 7209.1790, 7209.1810, 7209.1891, 7209.1899, 7209.2510, 7209.2590, 7209.2610, 7209.2690, 7209.2710, 7209.2790, 7209.2810 and 7209.2890"
- 13.1.2 The product under review is generally used in production of automotive components, tubes and sections, domestic appliances, electrical goods, Tin Mill Black plate products, oil filters, hardware, packaging drums, furniture and fixtures, gates, etc.
- 13.1.3 In its latest investigation (A.D.C No. 60/2021/NTC/CRC), the Commission excluded CR Coils/Sheets used in automotive outer skins of four-wheeler vehicles of certain grades along with Tin Mill Black Plate (TMBP) from the purview of product under review. During the on-spot verification visit, the matter was discussed with the Applicants. As part of the verification process, the investigation team conducted a visit to the Applicants' production facility and confirmed that TMBP had been manufactured during the Period of Review (POR). To further substantiate this finding, the team obtained

records of TMBP sales made to customers during the POR. These records corroborate the Applicant's position that it produced and sold TMBP during the POR.

13.1.4 The Investigation has revealed that the domestic industry is producing different automotive grades of CR Coils/Sheets i.e. SPCC, SPCD, SPCE and SPCG. However, the following grades of CR Coils/Sheets have not been produced by the domestic industry during the POR:

Table-IV
Auto Grades not Produced Locally

| S.No. | Grade Description   |
|-------|---|
| i.    | JAC, JSC, JEH – 270, 340PN, 440WN, 590RN, SCGA 270-45, SCGA590DU-45       |
| ii.   | SPCO-S, SECC-0/20, SPCEN, SEHC-0/20,                                      |
| iii.  | JSC26OGN-2 (SPCX), JAH59ORN 45/45   |
| iv.   | SPFC490-SPFC980Y, SPH & SPRC – 440, SCGA 440-45, SHGA 440-45 V, SCGA 340  |
| .,    | SUS 304, SUS 409LT-E/ SUH 409L/HFS 409L, SUS 429M, SUS 432T / SUS 436J1L, |
| ٧.    | SUS 436L/ SUS 436MT, SUS 439MT  |
| vi.   | HFS 429M, HFS 436L, HSS 441   |
| vii.  | SA1C-80, SA1D-80 -CZ/ SA1D 40/40 CZ, SACE-120, SA1E-80                    |
| viii. | MSM-CC-DZC-90/90  |
| ix.   | SAE1050, SAE1070, SAE1078, JS-SK60, JS-SK85                               |

13.1.5 Accordingly, the above-mentioned grades have been excluded from the scope of the product under review. Therefore, the product under review for the purpose of this review is: flat-rolled products of iron or non-alloy steel of a thickness ranging from 0.15 mm to 3.00 mm, cold- rolled (cold- reduced), not clad, plated or coated, of prime and secondary quality ("CR Coils/Sheets"), of in rolls or slit to length sheets, excluding CR Coils/ Sheets used in automotive outer skins of four wheeler vehicles and following auto grades imported from the Exporting Countries (the product under review):

#### S.No. Grade

- i. JAC, JSC, JEH 270, 340PN, 440WN, 590RN, SCGA 270-45, SCGA590DU-45
- ii. SPCO-S, SECC-0/20, SPCEN, SEHC-0/20,
- iii. JSC26OGN-2 (SPCX), JAH59ORN 45/45
- iv. SPFC490-SPFC980Y, SPH & SPRC 440, SCGA 440-45, SHGA 440-45 V, SCGA 340
- SUS 304, SUS 409LT-E/ SUH 409L/HFS 409L, SUS 429M, SUS 432T / SUS 436J1L,
- SUS 436L/ SUS 436MT, SUS 439MT
- vi. HFS 429M, HFS 436L, HSS 441
- vii. SA1C-80, SA1D-80 -CZ/ SA1D 40/40 CZ, SACE-120, SA1E-80
- viii. MSM-CC-DZC-90/90
- ix. SAE1050, SAE1070, SAE1078, JS-SK60, JS-SK85
- 13.1.6 The product under review is classified under Pakistan Customs Tariff Heading Nos. 7209.1510, 7209.1590, 7209.1610, 7209.1690, 7209.1710, 7209.1790, 7209.1810, 7209.1891, 7209.1899, 7209.2510, 7209.2590, 7209.2610, 7209.2690, 7209.2710, 7209.2790, 7209.2810 and 7209.2890.

13.2 The following table shows the current tariff structure (2024-25) applicable to imports of CR Coils/ Sheets:

> Table-V **Tariff Structure of CR Coils/Sheets** (%)

|             | Tariff Structure of CR Colls/Sneets (%)                                  |                     |         |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------|--|---------------------|---------|--|--|--|--|--|
| PCT Heading | Description  | Customs + Add. Duty | RD*     | FTAs/PTAs  |  |  |  |  |
| Chapter 72  | Iron and Steel   |                     |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 72.09       | Flat- rolled products of iron or non (cold-reduced), not clad, plated or | r coated.           |         | 00mm or more, cold-rolled                                      |  |  |  |  |
| 72.00       | - In coils, not further worked than                                      |                     | duced)  |  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Of a thickness of 3mm or more;   |                     |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1510   | Of secondary quality   | 20+6                | 10      | CN_23=8; CN_24=5.33;<br>MY=10; SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100% |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1590   | Other  | 11+2                | 10      | CN_5; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%                |  |  |  |  |
|             | Of a thickness exceeding 1mm   | but less than 3mm   |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1610   | Of secondary quality   | 20+6                | 10      | CN_12.8; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%             |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1690   | Others   | 11+2                | 10      | CN_5; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%                |  |  |  |  |
|             | Of a thickness of 0.5mm or more but not exceeding 1mm                    |                     |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1710   | Of secondary quality   | 20+6                | 10      | CN_12.8; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%             |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1790   | Other  | 11+2                | 10      | CN_5; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%                |  |  |  |  |
|             | Of a thickness of less than 0.5  | mm                  | I       | <u> </u>   |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1810   | Of secondary quality   | 20+6                | 10      | CN_12.8; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%             |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1891   | Tin mill black plate of thickness 0.30 mm or less                        | 11+2                | 10      | CN_5; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%                |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.1899   | Other  | 11+2                | 10      | CN_5; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%                |  |  |  |  |
|             | - Not in coils, not further worked the                                   |                     | d-reduc | ed)  |  |  |  |  |
|             | Of a thickness of 3mm or more  | ):                  |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.2510   | Of secondary quality   | 20+6                | 10      | CN_23=8; CN_24=5.33;<br>MY=10; SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100% |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.2590   | Other  | 11+2                | 10      | CN_5; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc.= 100%                 |  |  |  |  |
|             | Of a thickness exceeding 1mm   | but less than 3mm   |         |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7209.2610   | Of secondary quality   | 20+6                | 10      | CN_23=14.67;<br>CN_24=13.33; MY=10;                            |  |  |  |  |

|           |                                 |                    |       | SAFTA=5; LK_FTA  |
|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------|--|
|           |                                 |                    |       | Conc. = 100%   |
| 7209.2690 | Other                           | 11+2               | 10    | CN_5; MY=10;   |
| 7209.2090 | Other                           | 1172               | 10    | LK_FTA Conc. = 100%  |
|           | Of a thickness exceeding 0.5m   | m but not exceedin | g 1mm |  |
| 7209.2710 | Of secondary quality            | 20+6               | 10    | CN_23=14.67;<br>CN_24=13.33; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5; LK_FTA<br>Conc. = 100% |
| 7209.2790 | Other                           | 11+2               | 10    | CN_5; MY=10;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%                                    |
|           | Of a thickness of less than 0.5 | mm                 |       |  |
| 7209.2810 | Of secondary quality            | 20+6               | 10    | CN_23=14.67;<br>CN_24=13.33; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5; LK_FTA<br>Conc. = 100% |
| 7209.2890 | Other                           | 11+2               | 10    | CN_5; MY=10;<br>SAFTA=5;<br>LK_FTA Conc. = 100%                        |

<sup>\*10%</sup> till 31 December 2024; 5% w.e.f. 1st January 2025. The Tariff Policy Board, in its 61<sup>st</sup> Meeting held on December 26, 2024, decided to extend the 10% Regulatory Duty on the said PCTs for 3 months till March 31, 2025. Source: Pakistan Customs Tariff

**Domestic like Product** 

14.

# 14.1 Domestic like product means the like product that is produced by the domestic industry. The domestically produced product is flat-rolled products of iron or non-alloy steel, cold-rolled (cold-reduced), not clad, plated or coated, of prime and secondary quality, of a thickness ranging from 0.15 mm to 3.00 mm in rolls or slit to length sheets, excluding CR Coils/ Sheets used in automotive skins of four wheelers and auto grades mentioned at Table-IV supra. The domestic like product is classified under Pakistan

mentioned at Table-IV supra. The domestic like product is classified under Pakistan Customs Tariff Heading Nos. 7209.1510, 7209.1590, 7209.1610, 7209.1690, 7209.1710, 7209.1790, 7209.1810, 7209.1891, 7209.1899, 7209.2510, 7209.2590, 7209.2610, 7209.2690, 7209.2710, 7209.2790, 7209.2810 and 7209.2890.

14.2 The domestic product is also used in the production of automotive components, tubes and sections, domestic appliances, electrical goods, Tin Mill Black plate products, oil filters, hardware, packaging drums, furniture and fixtures, gates, etc.

#### 15. **Period of Review**

The period of review ("POR") for this sunset review is from October 01, 2020, to September 30, 2023.

#### 16. <u>Information/Data Gathering</u>

16.1 The Commission sent questionnaires on March 20, 2024, to all known exporters/ producers of CR Coils/Sheets in the Exporting Countries whose addresses were available with the Commission, asking them to respond within 37 days of the dispatch of the

questionnaires. A copy of the Questionnaire was sent to the Embassy of The Exporting Countries in Islamabad on March 20, 2024, with a request to forward it to all known exporters/ producers of CR Coils/Sheets in the Exporting Countries. Questionnaires were also sent to known importers of CR Coils/Sheets requesting them to provide information within 37 days.

- 16.2 No response from any exporters/foreign producers and importers was received within the prescribed time. Therefore, reminders were issued to the exporters/foreign producers and importers on May 15, 2024, explaining that, if no response of the questionnaire is submitted, the Commission will be constrained to make likely continuation or recurrence of dumping of the product under review on the basis of "best information available" including those contained in the application submitted by the Applicants. None of the exporters/ foreign producers from the Exporting Countries or importers have responded to the Commission and did not provide requisite information. However, Karachi Iron Steel and Merchants Association (KISMA), an association of importers submitted the information on importers' questionnaire on June 28, 2024.
- 16.3 Questionnaires were sent to domestic producers (other than the Applicants) on March 20, 2024, asking them to respond within 37 days of the dispatch of the questionnaires. No other producer has provided requisite information.
- 16.4 The Commission has access to the import statistics of Pakistan Revenue Automation Limited ("PRAL"), the data processing arm of the Federal Board of Revenue, Government of Pakistan. For the purpose of this review the Commission has also used import data obtained from PRAL's database in addition to the information provided by the Applicants. In addition to this, the Commission has also obtained certain information from publicly available sources, which, *inter-alia*, include the International Trade Centre's website (<a href="https://www.trademap.org">www.trademap.org</a>) and some other sources.

#### 17. <u>Views, Comments and Hearing</u>

- 17.1 All interested parties were invited for their views/comments known to the Commission and to submit information and documents (if any) regarding this sunset review. In response, the Commission received views/comments, information and documents from KISMA and Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation.
- 17.2 The interested parties were required to request a hearing in the review within 30 days of publication of the notice of initiation. In response, KISMA requested a hearing, which was held on September 10, 2024. The Commission invited all registered interested parties to attend the hearing. The information submitted by the participants during the hearing and the record note of the hearing prepared by the Commission was placed in the public file for review and copy of interested parties.

17.3 The Commission has reviewed all issues raised by the interested parties during the course of this review investigation, including the issues raised in the hearing and regarding the Statement of Essential Facts and has reached this conclusion of review after consideration of all information, evidence, views and comments. Views/ comments of the interested parties germane to this review and response of the Commission are given in an annotated form at Annexure-I.

#### 18. <u>Verification of Information</u>

- 18.1 In terms of Section 23, 32(4) and 35 of the Act and Rule 11 of the Rules, the Commission, during the course of the investigation/review, satisfied itself with the accuracy of information supplied by the interested parties to the extent possible.
- 14.2 In order to verify the information/data provided by the Applicants and to obtain further information (if any), the officers of the Commission conducted on-the-spot verifications at the offices and plants of M/s. International Steels Limited, Karachi on July 29 and 30, 2024, and M/s Aisha Steel Mills Limited, Karachi on July 31 and August 01, 2024. Reports of on-the-spot verifications were made available to the interested parties by placing them in the public file.

#### 19. **Public File**

The Commission, in accordance with Rule 7 of the Rules, has established and maintained a public file of this sunset review at its office. This file remains available to the interested parties for review and copying from Monday to Thursday between 1100 hours to 1300 hours throughout the review investigation. This file contains non-confidential versions of the application, submissions, notices, on-the-spot investigation reports, correspondence, and other documents for disclosure to the interested parties.

#### 20. **Confidentiality**

- 20.1 In terms of Section 31 of the Act, the Commission shall keep confidential any information submitted to it, which is by nature confidential, or determined by the Commission to be of confidential nature for any other reason, or provided as confidential by parties to an investigation upon good cause shown, to be kept confidential.
- 20.2 The Applicants have requested the Commission to keep confidential the information, which is by nature confidential in terms of Section 31 of the Act. This information includes data relating to sales, sale prices, cost to make and sell, inventories, production, profit/(loss), return on investment, cash flow, growth, investment, salaries and wages, number of employees and capacity etc. In addition to this, Applicants also provided certain information on confidential basis, as its disclosure would cause adverse effect upon them.

20.3 Pursuant to requests made by the Applicants, to treat certain information as confidential, the Commission has determined confidentiality in light of Section 31 of the Act and for the reasons that disclosure of such information may be of significant competitive advantage to the competitor, or because its disclosure would have a significant adverse effect upon the interested parties providing such information. However, in terms of Section 31(5), non-confidential summaries of all confidential information, which provide reasonable understanding of the substance, have been placed in the public file.

#### 21. <u>Disclosure of Essential Facts</u>

- 21.1 In terms of Rule 15(1) of the Rules, the Commission disclosed essential facts, and in this context circulated a Statement of Essential Facts (the "SEF") on January 20, 2025, to all interested parties including Applicants, exporters/producers from the Exporting Countries, importers and the Embassy of the Exporting Countries in Pakistan.
- 21.2 Under Rule 15(2) of the Rules, the interested parties were required to submit their comments (if any) on the facts disclosed in SEF, in writing, not later than fifteen days of such disclosure. In response, Karachi Iron Steel and Merchant Association (KISMA) and the Trade Representation of the Russian Federation in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on behalf of Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation and the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation submitted comments on SEF.
- 21.3 Views/comments and information submitted by the above-mentioned interested parties have been considered in making conclusion on this sunset review. Views/Comments of the interested parties germane to this review investigation and response of the Commission are provided at Annexure-II of this report.

#### 22. Determination of Likely Continuation or Recurrence of Dumping

Determination of likely continuation or recurrence of dumping of the product under review from the Exporting Countries is made in accordance with Rule 40 of the Rules and other relevant provisions of the Act. As no exporter has provided any information (paragraph 16.1 and 16.2 supra), therefore, likely continuation or recurrence of dumping of the product under review is determined on the basis of best information available. Information on these factors has been gathered/obtained from different sources including the Applicants, FBR, articles published in different journals, websites of exporters and producers of CR Coils/Sheets, ITC & other sources etc. The Commission has considered the following factors in determination of likely continuation or recurrence of dumping of the product under review:

 (a) whether exporters/ producers from the exporting countries stopped or continued exporting the product under review to Pakistan after the imposition of anti-dumping duties;

- (b) calculation of likely dumping margins for exporters or producers of the exporting country;
- (c) the past and likely future performance of the exporters, foreign producers, including production, capacity utilization, the potential to extend production facilities, costs, sales volumes, prices, inventories, market share, exports, exportable surplus, profits, etc.
- (d) whether exporters from the exporting countries have developed other export markets after the imposition of anti-dumping duties on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheet;
- (e) trade remedial actions taken by other countries on the exports of the product under review and whether such actions are likely to cause a diversion of imports into Pakistan;
- (f) changes in market conditions in the exporting country and internationally, including changes in the supply of and demand for the product under review;

# 22.1 Whether exporters/producers from the Exporting Countries stopped or continued exporting the product under review to Pakistan after imposition of Anti-dumping Duty

22.1.1 The analysis of whether exporters/ producers from the exporting countries stopped or continued exporting the product under review to Pakistan after imposition of anti-dumping duty has revealed that the exports of the product under review from the Exporting Countries have substantially decreased after imposition of anti-dumping duty. The following table shows the volume of dumped imports from the Exporting Countries, other dumped imports and imports from sources other than dumped sources after imposition of anti-dumping duty:

Table-VI Imports of CR Coils/Sheets (Volume)

| ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, |                            |             |       |              |        |        | ( )         |            |
|---|----------------------------|-------------|-------|--------------|--------|--------|-------------|------------|
| Year/Period                             | Imports from the Exporting |             |       | Other Dumped |        | Non-   | Total       | Dumped     |
|   | Cou                        | ntries (Dum | nped) | Imp          | oorts  | Dumped | Imports     | (exporting |
|   | Canada                     | Russia      | Total | China        | Others | Import |             | countries) |
|   |                            |             |       |              |        |        |             | as % of    |
|   |                            |             |       |              |        |        |             | total      |
|   |                            |             |       |              |        |        |             | imports    |
| (1)                                     | (2)                        | (3)         | (4)   | (5)          | (6)    | (7)    | (8)=(4+5+6) | (8)        |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*                          | 7.21                       | 43.57       | 50.78 | 11.17        |        | 38.05  | 100.00      | 50.78      |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21                         | 0.56                       |             | 0.56  | 2.30         | 43.74  | 14.76  | 61.35       | 0.91       |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22                         | 0.08                       | 2.68        | 2.75  | 4.29         | 9.23   | 10.03  | 26.30       | 10.47      |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23                         | 0.29                       | 0.57        | 0.86  | 9.74         | 3.63   | 4.07   | 18.30       | 4.69       |

<sup>\*</sup> POI of original investigation Source: FBR

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of total imports in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 22.1.2 The table above indicates a significant decline in the volume of dumped imports from the Exporting Countries during the period of review as compared to POI of original investigation. This reduction in the volume of dumped imports of product under review was mainly due to imposition of anti-dumping duty. During the original POI, dumped imports accounted for 50.78 percent of total imports, which decreased to less than one percent in the first year of the POR. During the last two years of POR i.e. Oct 21 Sep 22 and Oct 22- Sept 23, the share of dumped imports in total imports of the product under review was 10.47 percent and 4.69 percent respectively.
- 22.1.3 On the basis of information and analysis above, the Commission is of the view that the anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped import of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries is the reason for sharp decline in volume of dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets. Therefore, in case anti-dumping duty imposed on the dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries is terminated, there is likelihood of its recurrence of dumping into Pakistan.

#### 22.2 Dumping Margins for the Exporting Countries

22.2.1 As stated earlier (paragraph 16 supra) the Commission sent questionnaires to exporters/ producers whose complete addresses were available with the Commission. A copy of the questionnaire was also provided to the embassies of the Exporting Countries in Islamabad with a request to forward it to all exporters/ foreign producers of the product under review to submit information to the Commission. However, the Commission did not receive information in response to the questionnaire from any of the exporter/ foreign producer of the product under review in this sunset review. Therefore, dumping of the product under review is determined on the basis of the best information available in accordance with Section 32 of the Act. Details of determination of normal value, export price and dumping margin are provided in the following paragraphs:

#### 22.2.2 Normal value

In terms of Section 5 of the Act, normal value is a "comparable price paid or payable, in the ordinary course of trade, for sales of a like product when destined for consumption in an exporting country". However, in terms of Section 6 of the Act, when there are no sales of a like product in the ordinary course of trade in domestic market of an exporting country, or when such sales do not permit a proper comparison because of any particular market situation or low volume of the sales in the domestic market of the exporting country, the normal value of an investigated product could be either:

- a) a comparable price of the like product when exported to an appropriate third country provided that this price is representative; or
- b) the cost of production in the exporting country plus a reasonable amount for administrative, selling, and general costs and profits.

#### 22.2.3 Export Price

In terms of section 10 of the Act, the export price shall be a price actually paid or payable for an investigated product when sold for export from an exporting country to Pakistan.

#### 22.2.4 Normal Value of CR Coils/Sheets for the Exporting Countries

- 22.2.4.1 The Commission has determined the normal value for Canada on the basis of domestic prices of CR Coils/ Sheets obtained from the MEPS International Monthly Steel Review (https://mepsinternational.com). MEPS International is a leading provider of steel market data and analysis, which carries out research into global steel prices, indices, and forecasts. The normal value reported at MEPS International for Canada are ex-works prices for North America (which includes Canada).
- 22.2.4.2 The normal value of CR Coils/Sheets for Russia determined on the basis of domestic prices of CR Coils/Sheets obtained from Fastmarkets Global Limited (https://www.fastmarkets.com), a reputable cross-commodity price reporting agency specializing in the agriculture, forest products, metals and mining, and emerging energy markets. According to Fastmarkets, the reported price for CR Coils/Sheets in Russia is provided on a Carriage Paid To (CPT) basis to Moscow, inclusive of a 20 percent Value Added Tax (VAT). To determine the normal value of CR Coils/Sheets for Russia, adjustments are made to exclude the 20 percent VAT and account for inland freight cost. Inland freight is assumed to be 1.00 percent of the price.

#### 22.2.5 Export Price of CR Coils/Sheets

- 22.2.5.1 As stated earlier (paragraph 13 supra) none of the exporter/ producers from the Exporting Countries provided information in response to the questionnaire, therefore, export price has been worked out on the basis of the information/data obtained from Pakistan Customs on imports of the product under review during the POR.
- 22.2.5.2 The data obtained from Pakistan Customs shows prices at C & F level. To reach at ex-factory level, the C&F export prices are adjusted on account of ocean freight, inland freight, handling charges, and insurance. In support of ocean freight, the Applicants have submitted shipping rate from the website; MoverDB (<a href="https://moverdb.com/container-shipping/pakistan/">https://moverdb.com/container-shipping/pakistan/</a>) based on which it calculated Ocean freight for Canada and for Russia the ocean freight calculated by adjusting the shipping rate of port near to Russia obtained from MoverDB. The handling charges and internal freight are assumed to be 1.00 percent and insurance 0.09 percent of C&F price.

#### 22.2.6 **Likely Dumping Margins**

22.2.6.1 The Commission has calculated the dumping margin by comparing the normal value with the export price at the ex-factory level. Based on this evaluation, it has

been determined that the normal value of the product from the Exporting Countries exceeds its export price. Consequently, the Commission has concluded that the product under review is being dumped by the Exporting Countries.

- 22.2.6.2 Based on the information and analysis in preceding paragraphs (22.2.4 to 22.2.5 supra), it is concluded that the product under review is exported to Pakistan from the Exporting Countries at dumped prices.
- 22.3 The past and likely future performance of the exporters, foreign producers, including production, capacity utilization, the potential to extend production facilities, costs, sales volumes, prices, inventories, market share, exports, exportable surplus, profits, etc.
- 22.3.1 As stated earlier, no exporter/foreign producer provided any information in this review, therefore, a country-wide performance of the Exporting Countries for the product under review is assessed on the basis of best information available.
- 22.3.2 According to a report titled 'Latest Developments in Steel Making Capacity 2023' by the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development ("OECD"), there are some significant expansions in process or planned in the Exporting Countries. Summary of the capacity expansion in furnaces is provided in following table:

Table-VII
Exporting Countries' Plant Level Investments and their Owners

| Exporting<br>Country | Company                            | Capacity (000'<br>tons) | Status    |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------|
| Canada               | Algoma                             | 3,700                   | Planned   |
| Canada               | ArcelorMittal                      | 2,400                   | Planned   |
| Russia               | United Metallurgical Company (OMK) | 1,800                   | under way |
| Russia               | Metalloinvest                      | 1,200                   | Planned   |

22.3.3 According to an article published on the website: Manufacturing today (<a href="https://manufacturing-today.com/news/algoma-steel/">https://manufacturing-today.com/news/algoma-steel/</a>) the Algoma Steel – Zeal Steel, a Canadian Steel company's expansion is stated as follows:

"Thanks to this multi-million-dollar capital injection, Algoma was able to start work on three new projects in 2020. The first of these projects saw the company upgrade its flagship direct strip production complex, increasing capacity from 2.1 million tons to 2.4 million tons. Secondly, Algoma commissioned its second Ladle Metallurgy Facility, adding an extra 100,000 tons of capacity. Finally, the funding will allow for the modernization of the organization's plate mill, a project that is well underway and will be completed in late 2022."

22.3.4 As per Global Steel Plant Tracker (GSPT), the details of Arcelormittal Canada Steel plant are as follows:

"In July 2021, a 2400-thousand tons expansion to the ArcelorMittal Dofasco plant was proposed, with an anticipated completion date of 2028. The expansion represents a 1.756 billion CAD investment (with 400 million CAD coming from federal government support).

22.3.5 According to a publication "Examples of policies and practices contributing to the global excess capacity crisis" by American Iron and Steel Institute and Steel Manufacturers Association, various government support offered to steel sector in Canada are contributing to significant excess capacities and it has provided following examples of government support provided to Canadian Steel Sector:

"In June 2018, the Canadian government established a fund of upto C\$2 billion to assist the Canadian steel industry. This includes up to C\$1.7 billion in financing assistance to support the installation of new production equipment. The Canadian government has also used its Strategic Innovation Fund to provide significant subsidies to Canadian Steel producers.

Stelco, Inc., a major steel producer in Canada, has gone into bankruptcy twice in this century. Both bankruptcies involved significant Canadian government support, including nearly C\$200 million (U.S.\$156.4) in low-interest loans and cancellation or reduction of tax and pension liabilities. In August 2019, after Stelco emerged from its second bankruptcy, the government of Canada announced funding for Stelco from its Strategic Innovation Fund: a C\$49.9 million (U.S.\$37.5 million) investment in Stelco to support a project "that will create 75 jobs and maintain 2,200 more in Ontario.

Algoma Steel, Inc., another major Canadian steel producer, has been granted bankruptcy protection on three different occasions since the early 1990s. In January 2019, the government of Canada and government of Ontario announced up to C\$150 million (U.S.\$113.4 million) in funding for Algoma.

Dofasco Steel received a grant from the Canadian government's Strategic Innovation Fund of C\$49.9 million in November 2018. This assistance was in addition to the financial assistance Dofasco received from the Ontario provincial government.

Evraz received C\$40million (\$29.8million) from the Canadian Government to support new capital expenditures in its OCTG mill in Regina, Saskatchewan. Gerdau Ameristeel received a grant of C\$20 million from the Strategic Innovation Fund to support capital investment at two of its facilities.

Nova Tub received a grant of C\$14 million from the Strategic Innovation Fund to support capital investment in its Montreal tube plant to increase production capacity."

22.3.6 As per an article "The Russian steel industry expects capacity underutilization according to the results of 2022" published by GMK center in September 2022:

"Steel consumption in the Russian Federation in the second quarter of 2022 decreased by 16% q/q.

In 2022, Russian steelmakers forecast capacity underutilization at the level of more than 15 million tons compared to 2021. The reason for underloading will be a reduction in domestic steel consumption, Russian mass media write.

Oleksiy Mordashov, president of the Russian Steel association and owner of Severstal, stated this in a letter to the Russian government. The organization unites the largest producers of steel products in the country, in particular, Evraz, NLMK, MMK and others.

As the letter notes, in the second quarter of 2022 domestic steel consumption decreased by 16% compared to the previous quarter. It is expected that in the second half of 2022, the consumption of steel products will decrease by 22% compared to January-June 2022.

A decrease in the steel production increases the cost of its smelting and forces Russian steelmakers to reduce investments.

According to the association, the Russian government is currently working on a mechanism for setting steel products prices. The mechanism applies to organizations performing state contracts at a level no higher than at the end of January 2019. Such pricing is similar to contracts for state defense orders.

The extension of the mechanism will lead to the fact that a large share of steel products will fall under regulation. This will force steelmakers to produce and ship products with significant negative profitability.

The industry is already considering the options of stopping part of the main units, switching to a part-time working week and significantly reducing employees. Also, steelmakers say that the current crisis can negatively affect the socio-economic situation in the regions of presence.

According to GMK Center analyst Andrii Glushchenko, the sanctions of the EU and the United States also undermined the export opportunities of Russian steelmakers.

"This year, there were already news about capacity underutilization, as it was not possible to reorient sales to alternative markets. Expectations regarding supplies to Southeast Asia have not been fulfilled. Supply bypassing sanctions is possible, but it is obvious that these volumes will be smaller than under

conditions of free trade with the European Union and the United States. Firstly, it complicates the delivery process. Secondly, the EU and the United States will oppose the circumvention of sanctions, as they have already warned Turkish business, which wanted to act as an intermediary in trade with the Russian Federation," he noted.

As GMK Center reported earlier, Russian steel producers continue to export to the EU bypassing sanctions. Russian NLMK supplies products to the EU market through the Belgian subsidiary NLMK Belgium Holdings SA and SOGEPA."

22.3.7 From the above information and analysis, the Commission is of the view that the installed production capacities of steel products including the product under review of the exporting countries have increased and it has exportable surplus to dump in Pakistan. Therefore, in case anti-dumping duty is terminated, there is a likelihood of recurrence or continuation of dumping of the product under review.

# 22.4 <u>whether exporters from the exporting countries have developed other export markets after the imposition of anti-dumping duties on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheet;</u>

22.4.1 To assess the impact of the anti-dumping duties imposed on exports of the product under review from the Exporting Countries, the Commission has analyzed the information obtained from Trade Map which reveals that there has been increased in total exports of Canada, however, in case of Russia total exports have declined. The following table shows major export destinations of the Exporting Countries under the HS code at a 6-digit level which also includes the product under review:

Table-VIII

| Major Export Markets of Canada |               |                             |               |  |  |
|--------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| 2018                           |               | 2023                        |               |  |  |
| Destination Quantity (MT       |               | Destination                 | Quantity (MT) |  |  |
| (1)                            | (2)           | (3)                         | (4)           |  |  |
| World                          | 348,970       | World                       | 450,138       |  |  |
| United States of<br>America    | 337,050       | United States of<br>America | 447,097       |  |  |
| Bangladesh                     | 3,730         | Bangladesh                  | 1,930         |  |  |
| Pakistan                       | 3,469         | Pakistan                    | 207           |  |  |
| Egypt                          | 1,589         | Belgium                     | 180           |  |  |
| Mexico                         | 772           | Mexico                      | 534           |  |  |
| Others                         | 2,360         | Others                      | 190           |  |  |
|                                |               |                             |               |  |  |
|                                | Major Export  | Markets of Russia           |               |  |  |
| 2018                           |               | 2023                        |               |  |  |
| Destination                    | Quantity (MT) | Destination                 | Quantity (MT) |  |  |
| (1)                            | (2)           | (3)                         | (4)           |  |  |

| World                       | 1,208,288 | World      | 351,172 |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|---------|
| Türkiye                     | 501,660   | Türkiye    | 177,417 |
| Uzbekistan                  | 84,903    | Uzbekistan | 93,858  |
| Pakistan                    | 101,469   | Pakistan   | 487     |
| Belarus                     | 165,194   | Kyrgyzstan | 26,856  |
| United States of<br>America | 90,456    | Azerbaijan | 13,703  |
| Ukraine                     | 69,383    | Kazakhstan | 13,556  |
| Egypt                       | 66,382    | Egypt      | 4,638   |
| Others                      | 128,841   | Others     | 20,657  |

Source: Trademap

- 22.4.2 The above table shows that during last five years there is an increase in total exports of Canada. The United States of America remained the primary destination for Canadian steel exports during the original POI and in 2023, accounting for over 95% of total exports to the USA. In 2023, Canada established only one new export market which is Belgium, and exported 180 MT. However, exports to Pakistan experienced a significant decline in 2023 compared to 2018, primarily due to the imposition of an anti-dumping duty.
- 22.4.3 In the case of Russia, trade data regarding its exports for the year 2023 was not available on Trademap, therefore mirror data has been used. The above table reveals that there is significant reduction in the total exports of Russia in 2023 as compared to the original POI. The Russian global exports dropped by nearly 70% in 2023 as compared to 2018. Türkiye, a key destination for Russian flat steel in 2018, maintained its position as the top export market in 2023. However, Russian flat steel exports to Türkiye saw a similar 64% decline in 2023. Similarly, Pakistan, which was the third-largest export destination during the original period of investigation, received only 487 MT of shipments from Russia in 2023. Russia has developed three new export markets which are Kyrgyzstan, Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan during 2023. Russia must be keen to export to Pakistan in the absence of anti-dumping duty, as it has idle capacity.
- 22.4.4 The above information shows that Exporting countries have a surplus production capacity. Consequently, the removal of the anti-dumping duty on the product under review is likely to result in an increase in imports of this product from the exporting countries.

# 22.5 <u>Trade remedial actions taken by other countries on the exports of the product under review and whether such actions are likely to cause a diversion of imports into Pakistan;</u>

22.5.1 To assess the likely recurrence or continuation of dumping of the product under review, the Commission has analyzed trade remedial actions taken by other countries against export of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries. The export of CR Coils/Sheets from Russia is subject to the following anti-dumping measures by different Member countries, however, there are no trade remedy measures against export of CR Coils/Sheets from Canada.

Table – IX
Anti-dumping Duties on Exports of CR Coils/Sheets from Russia

| Importing<br>Country | Trade<br>Remedy<br>Measure | Anti-dumping<br>Duties | Exporting<br>Country  | Date of Imposition                                  |
|----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|---|
| (1)                  | (2)                        | (3)                    | (4)                   | (5)   |
| European Union       | Anti-Dumping               | 18.7% – 31.6%          | Russian<br>Federation | 29-07-2016<br>(Latest extension date<br>27/10/2022) |
| United Kingdom       | Anti-Dumping               | 18.7% – 31.6%          | Russian<br>Federation | 01-01-2021  |
| Mexico               | Anti-Dumping               | 83%-88%                | Russian<br>Federation | 29-06-1999<br>(Latest extension date<br>18/08/2020) |

Source: World Trade Organization

22.5.2 On the basis of above information, it is evident that the Russian exports of the product under review to other countries have also been subjected to trade remedy measures. Therefore, there is a likelihood of recurrence of dumping and increase in volume of dumped imports of the product under review if anti-dumping duty is terminated.

### 22.6 <u>Changes in market conditions in the exporting country and internationally, including changes in the supply of and demand for the product under review;</u>

22.6.1 The World Steel Association in its Short-Range Outlook (SRO) in April 2023 stated that steel demand is projected to grow by 1.7% in 2024 to reach 1,854.0 million tons. Manufacturing is expected to lead the recovery, but high interest rates will continue to weigh on steel demand. Russia's economy avoided a large-scale crisis in 2022, and steel demand contracted less than expected. In 2022 it was supported by pipeline projects and residential construction. On the other hand, manufacturing relying on imported parts suffered a material contraction. In 2023-2024, the construction sector is expected to slow down, and Russia's steel demand is expected to show an accelerating contraction in 2024. In the coming years, the Russian economy will face serious challenges due to Western sanctions as well as workforce leakage due to immigration and military mobilization.

22.6.2 As per article "Steel Industry: Global Trend" published by GMK Center about Iron and Steel Section in Europe and Globally,

"Due to EU sanctions, deliveries of flat products from Russia to the EU in 2022 fell by 75%, but still remained significant due to the first half of the year. For almost all positions of flat products, Russian exports have ceased since the middle of 2022. The exception was insignificant deliveries in the second half of 2022 in the range of 4-6 thousand tons of alloyed steel (HS – 7225) per month."

22.6.3 According to an article titled 'GUSTAFSON: The rise and fall of Russian steel':

"The Russian steel industry, a mainstay of the economy and a leading exporter, faces difficult times ahead. Western sanctions have all but closed its access to the European and US markets and technologies, forcing it to retrench back to the domestic Russian market and limiting its ability to innovate.

The important cause of Russian steel's future isolation will be growing competition from China. In the wake of China's economic slowdown, Beijing has removed its previous cap on steel production and is encouraging Chinese steelmakers to produce flat-out for export. As a result, the global market is being flooded with cheap Chinese steel, making Russian steel exports uncompetitive."

22.6.4 As per article "Global Steel Market Outlook 2023" published by CUMIC Market Research Team:

"sanctions have led to a reorientation of the Russian steel industry's target markets". The outlook further states that "Whereas the share of exports to Asian countries did not exceed 10-20% previously, about half of the steel products are exported to Asia, and China and Turkey import Russian steel in large quantities at preferential prices at the present time".

- 22.6.5 According to MEPS International dated 4th March 2024, the demand for flat steel products in Canada remains subdued at both the service center and end-user levels. The market for products derived from flat-rolled material, such as hollow structural sections and tubing, has also weakened. Restocking activities have not significantly increased since the beginning of the calendar year. Canadian buyers may be deferring purchases in anticipation of potential price reductions. Additionally, consumer-driven demand has been adversely affected by recent economic policies. Interest rate increases, introduced to address inflationary pressures, have raised borrowing costs, thereby reducing demand in numerous steel-consuming sectors.
- 22.6.6 The above information and analysis shows that the market conditions for product under review in the Exporting Countries are influenced by factors such as international sanctions, high interest rate and low demand of steel from downstream industry. The steel producer is navigating shifting market dynamics driven by the effects of sanctions, which have disrupted trade flows and resulted in underutilized production capacity while prompting efforts to explore alternative markets in Asia. Additionally, China's steel production policies play a significant role in influencing supply trends, thereby affecting pricing and trade movements across various regions.
- 22.6.7 Based on the information and analysis in paragraphs 22.1 to 22.6 supra, it is concluded that there is likelihood of recurrence and continuation of dumping of the product under review if antidumping duty on dumped imports is terminated.

### 23. <u>Determination of Likely Recurrence or Continuation of Injury to the Domestic Industry</u>

- 23.1 Likely recurrence and continuation of injury to the domestic industry is determined in accordance with Rule 41 of the Rules and other relevant provisions of the Act. The Commission has taken into account relevant factors in order to determine likely continuation or recurrence of injury to the domestic industry. To determine likelihood of continuation or recurrence of injury to the domestic industry, the Commission, *inter alia*, considered following factors:
  - Likely change in volume of imports of the product under review if antidumping duty is terminated;
  - ii. Likely impact of imports of the product under review on prices of the domestic like product with and without anti-dumping duty;
  - iii. Consequent likely impact on the domestic industry, which includes likely and potential decline in: sales, profits, output, market share, productivity, return on investment, capacity utilization and likely negative effects on: cash flow, inventories, employment, wages, growth, ability to raise capital or investments; and
  - iv. Changes in market conditions in the economy of Pakistan and internationally, including changes in the supply of and demand for the imports of the product under review
- 23.2 As stated earlier the domestic industry comprises of 5 units, but the information on all injury factors is available for Applicants only i.e. for 2 units. The Applicants are major units in the industry and constitute about 63 percent of the total installed capacity and around 84 percent of the total domestic production during October 01, 2022, to September 30, 2023, therefore, likelihood of continuation or recurrence of injury for factors other than production, sales, market share and capacity utilization is inferred from the Applicants information. Information/facts on injury factors are provided in the following paragraphs:

#### 23.3 Likely Effect on Volume of Dumped Imports

- 23.3.1 With regard to the volume of dumped imports, in terms of Section 15(2) of the Act, it is considered whether there would be significant increase in dumped imports, either in absolute terms or relative to the consumption or production of the domestic like product if the anti-dumping duty is terminated.
- 23.4.2 The following table shows information on imports of the product under review in period of original investigation ("POI"), period of review ("POR") and domestic consumption:

Table-X
Dumped Imports and Domestic Consumption

(Volume)

|                 | Dumped Imports                      |        |                  | <b>.</b>      | Domestic consumption | PUR as % of: |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--------|------------------|---------------|----------------------|--------------|
| Year/Period     | Par/Period DLD (Canada L Other Non- | dumped | Total<br>Imports | total imports |                      |              |
| (1)             | (2)                                 | (3)    | (4)              | (5)           | (6)                  | (7)          |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 51                                  | 11     | 38               | 100           | 219                  | 50.78        |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 0.6                                 | 46     | 15               | 61            | 199                  | 0.91         |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 2.8                                 | 14     | 10               | 26            | 126                  | 10.47        |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 0.9                                 | 13     | 4                | 18            | 81                   | 4.69         |

\* POI of Original Investigation

**PUR** = Product under review

Source: FBR and the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of total imports Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 23.4.3 The above table shows that the share of dumped imports from the Exporting Countries during the period of original investigation was 50.78 percent of total imports of CR Coils/Sheets which after imposition of anti-dumping duty substantially decreased to 4.69 percent during the last year of the period of review.
- 23.4.4 As there is likelihood that the dumped imports of the product under review will recur if anti-dumping duty is terminated (paragraph 22 supra), therefore, on the basis of above information and analysis, the Commission has concluded that termination of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports of product under review would likely lead to significant increase in the volume of dumped imports. Therefore, termination of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports would likely lead to the recurrence of injury to the domestic industry on account of the increase in volume of dumped imports.

#### 23.5 Likely Price Effects on the Domestic Like Product

23.5.1 Likely effects of dumped imports on the sales price of the domestic like product in the domestic market has been examined in the following paragraphs to establish whether there is likely price undercutting (the extent to which the price of the product under review will be lower than the price of the domestic like product), price depression (the extent to which the domestic industry may experience decrease in its selling prices of domestic like product) and price suppression (the extent to which increased cost of production would not be recovered by way of increase in selling price of the domestic like product) if anti-dumping duty on dumped import expires.

#### 23.5.2 Likely Effects on Price Undercutting

23.5.2.1 Information/data on the weighted average ex-factory price of the domestic like product and weighted average landed cost of the product under review, with and without anti-dumping duty during the original POI and POR are given in the following:

Table-XI Price Undercutting

(per MT)

| Year/Period     | Domestic   | Landed    | cost of the  |          | Price un | dercutting |         |
|-----------------|------------|-----------|--------------|----------|----------|------------|---------|
|                 | industry's | product u | ınder review | With AD  | D. duty  | Without A  | D. duty |
|                 | price      | With ADD  | Without ADD  | Absolute | %age     | Absolute   | %age    |
| -1              | -2         | -3        | -4           | -5       |          | -6         |         |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 100        | -         | 95           |          | -        | 5          | 5       |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 168        | 132       | 119          | 37       | 22       | 49         | 29      |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 223        | 256       | 230          |          | -        |            |         |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 265        | 288       | 260          |          | -        | 5          | 2       |

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of domestic industry's price in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 23.5.2.2 The above table shows that there was 4.90 percent price undercutting in the original POI. However, after the imposition of anti-dumping, the dumped imports declined significantly and the landed cost of dumped imports of the product under review remained higher than the prices of domestic like product during POR. However, without anti-dumping duty, the landed cost of the product under review was less than the price of the domestic like product and domestic industry would have faced price undercutting in the last year of POR. As far as price undercutting during the year Oct 20 Sep 21 is concerned, the landed cost may not be representative as it reflects insignificant volume of product under review having only 0.91% (Table-X supra) share of the total imports.
- 23.5.2.3 On the basis of the above information and analysis the Commission has determined that the domestic industry would likely face injury on account of price undercutting if the anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of the product under review from the Exporting Countries is terminated.

#### 23.5.3 Likely Effect on Price Depression

- 23.5.3.1 The information provided in the above table-XI shows that the prices of the domestic like product increased after imposition of anti-dumping duty throughout the POR. The domestic industry was able to increase its prices because the landed cost of the product under review with anti-dumping duty was higher than the prices of domestic like product. In case the anti-dumping duty had not been imposed, the domestic industry would not have been able to increase its prices, rather there would have been compelled to lower its prices to compete with dumped imports.
- 23.5.3.2 On the basis of the above information and analysis the Commission has concluded that there is a likelihood that the domestic industry will face price depression if the anti-dumping duty is terminated imposed on dumped imports of the product under review from the Exporting Countries.

#### 23.5.3 <u>Likely Effect on Price Suppression:</u>

23.5.3.1 The following table shows information with regard to the weighted average cost to make and sell and the weighted average ex-factory sales price of the domestic like product:

Table-XII Price Suppression

(per MT)

|                 | Domestic li  | Domestic like product's |                | Increase/decrease in: |             |  |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|-------------|--|
| Year/ Period    | Cost to make | Ex-factory price        | Cost to make & | Price                 | Suppression |  |
|                 | and sell     | Ex-ractory price        | sell           | Filce                 |             |  |
| (1)             | (2)          | (3)                     | (4)            | (5)                   |             |  |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 100          | 107                     | 24             | 21                    |             |  |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 151          | 180                     |                |                       |             |  |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 235          | 239                     | 84             | 59                    | 25          |  |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 269          | 284                     | 34             | 45                    |             |  |

\* POI of Original Investigation

Sources: the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of cost to make & sell in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 23.5.3.2 The above table shows that the domestic industry suffered price suppression in the original POI due to price undercutting, which prevented it from fully recovering increased costs. But, after imposition of anti-dumping duty, the domestic industry did not face price suppression except during Oct 21 Sep 22. However, the increase in price during this year was lower than the increase in cost to make and sell, but price remained above the cost to make and sell and below than the landed cost of the product under review. Thus, the domestic industry earned profits during this year as well.
- 23.5.3.3 As there is likelihood of price undercutting and price depression if anti-dumping duty imposed on the product under review from the Exporting Country expires (paragraphs 23.5.2 and 23.5.3 supra), therefore, there is likelihood that the domestic industry will not be able to recover increased cost to make and sell of the domestic like product if anti-dumping duty is removed on dumped imports. Thus, there is likelihood of price suppression to be faced by the domestic industry in case anti-dumping duty on dumped imports is terminated.
- 23.5.3.4 On the above information and analysis the Commission has concluded that there is likelihood of injury to the domestic industry on account of price suppression if anti-dumping duty is terminated on imports of the product under review.

#### 23.6 <u>Likely Effects in Sales and Market Share</u>

23.6.1 Following table shows the sales made by the domestic industry and the market share of domestic industry in the domestic market during the period of original investigation and period of review:

|       | Tab | le – XIII |              |
|-------|-----|-----------|--------------|
| Sales | and | Market    | <b>Share</b> |

|                 | Domestic Industry's Sales/share |            |              | Dumped Imports from: |                  |            | Non-Dumped   |            | Total Domestic |            |        |              |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|------------|--------|--------------|
| Year            | Applic                          | ants       | Oth<br>Produ |                      | PUR= (0<br>+ Rus |            | Othe<br>Dump |            | impo           | •          | Mai    |              |
|                 | Volume                          | %<br>share | Volume       | %<br>share           | Volume           | %<br>share | Volume       | %<br>share | Volume         | %<br>share | Volume | %<br>change# |
| (1)             | (2)                             | (3)        | (4)          | (5)                  | (6)              | (7)        | (8)          | (9)        | (10)           | (11)       | (12)   | (13)         |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 54.42                           | 54.42      |              |                      | 23.15            | 23.15      | 5.09         | 5.09       | 17.34          | 17.34      | 100.00 |              |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 52.82                           | 58.11      | 10.12        | 11.13                | 0.25             | 0.28       | 20.99        | 23.09      | 6.73           | 7.40       | 90.90  | -9.1         |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 37.19                           | 64.96      | 8.08         | 14.11                | 1.26             | 2.19       | 6.16         | 10.76      | 4.57           | 7.98       | 57.26  | -42.74       |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 24.41                           | 66.49      | 3.96         | 10.79                | 0.39             | 1.07       | 6.09         | 16.60      | 1.85           | 5.05       | 36.71  | -63.29       |

\* POI of Original Investigation #% change vis-à-vis original POI

Source: FBR and the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of total domestic market in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 23.6.2 The above table shows that the share of domestic industry increased after imposition of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports of the product under review. Market share of the domestic industry was 54 percent of the total market during the original POI, which substantially increased to 66 percent during the POR. Market share of product under review declined to the negligible level during the last year of POR.
- 23.6.3 The total domestic market of CR Coils/Sheets has significantly decreased i.e. by 63 percent since the imposition of anti-dumping duty. This sharp reduction in market size was particularly evident in the last two years of the POR. Consequently, sales of the domestic industry also dropped substantially, decreasing by approximately 55% during the POR. According to the Applicants, the considerable decline in domestic demand for CR Coils/Sheets between October 2021 and September 2023 was driven by the effects of COVID-19 and the economic slowdown. Factors such as high interest rates, reduced purchasing power, increased taxation, and lower disposable income contributed to this decline. The auto and construction sectors were the primary drivers of the reduced demand during this period.
- 23.6.4 Despite a substantial decline in both sales of the domestic industry and the overall domestic market, the domestic industry's export sales of the product under review increased substantially during the Period of Review (POR) compared to the original Period of Investigation (POI), highlights the domestic industry's excess production capacity and competitiveness, as it is evident from below table:

Table – XIV

Domestic Sales and Exports (Volume)

| Period          | Domestic Sales | Export Sales |
|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| (1)             | (2)            | (3)          |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 100.00         | 0.51         |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 97.06          | 11.77        |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 68.35          | 6.33         |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 44.86          | 4.24         |

<sup>\*</sup> POI of Original Investigation

Source: the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of domestic sales in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

23.6.5 On the basis of fore-going information and analysis, there is likelihood of an increase in volume of imports of the product under review if anti-dumping duty is terminated (paragraph 22 supra), resultantly there is a likelihood of significant increase in market share of dumped imports which will adversely affect sales and market share of the domestic industry.

#### 23.7 <u>Likely Effects on Production and Capacity Utilization</u>

23.7.1 The following table shows installed production capacity, production of the domestic like product and capacity utilization of the domestic industry during the period of original investigation and POR:

Table – XV
Production and Capacity Utilization (Volume)

| Year/ Period     | Installed<br>Capacity | Quantity<br>Produced | Capacity<br>Utilization (%) |
|------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|
| (1)              | (2)                   | (3)                  | (4)=3/2                     |
| Jan 18 - Dec 18* | 100                   | 63.65                | 63.65                       |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21  | 153                   | 65.79                | 43.13                       |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22  | 153                   | 43.16                | 28.29                       |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23  | 153                   | 23.03                | 15.10                       |

\* POI of Original Investigation

Source: Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of installed capacity in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 23.7.2 The above table shows indicates a substantial increase in the domestic industry's installed production capacity following the imposition of the anti-dumping duty on the product under review. However, the production of the domestic like product experienced a significant decline during POR, leading to a considerable drop in capacity utilization. This decrease in production and capacity utilization was primarily driven by a significant reduction in domestic demand/market of the CR Coils/sheets (Table-XIII supra).
- 23.7.3 As there is likelihood of increase in volume of dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets if anti-dumping duty is removed (paragraphs 22 and 23.3 supra), which would negatively impact the sales and market share of the domestic industry, consequently leading to a decline in production and capacity utilization, therefore, on the basis of the above information and analysis it is concluded that the domestic industry would likely face injury on account of production and capacity utilization in case of termination of the anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries.

#### 23.8 Likely Effects on Profits

23.8.1 Net profits/(loss) of the domestic industry during the period of original investigation and POR is given in the following table:

Table-XVI Applicants' Profits/Loss

| Year/Period     | Net Profit/(Loss) |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| Teal/Tellou     | (Value)           |
| (1)             | (2)               |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 100               |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 427               |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 45                |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 104               |

\* POI of Original Investigation

Source: the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of profit in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 23.8.2 The above table shows that the profits of the domestic industry on production and sales of the domestic like product increased significantly during the first year of the POR. According to the Applicants, during the original POI, dumped imports had a severe negative impact on the domestic industry's profits, as lower-priced imports undercut domestic prices, leading to lost sales and price suppression.
- 23.8.3 As there is likelihood of significant increase in volume of dumped imports of the product under review (paragraph 23.4 supra) and adverse price effects (paragraph 23.4 supra) if anti-dumping duty on CR Coils/Sheets is removed, therefore, the domestic industry would likely face injury on account of decline in profits on termination of anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries.

#### 23.9 <u>Likely Effects on Inventories</u>

23.9.1 Inventory position of domestic like product during the period of original investigation and POR is given in the following table:

Table – XVII
Inventories of the Domestic Like Product (Volume)

| Period          | Opening<br>Inventory | Closing<br>Inventory |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| (1)             | (2)                  | (3)                  |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 100                  | 254                  |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 28                   | 121                  |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 121                  | 139                  |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 139                  | 27                   |

\* POI of Original Investigation

Sources: the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures have been indexed w.r.t. figure of opening inventory in Jan 18-Dec 18 by taking it equal to 100.

- 23.9.2 The above table illustrates that the closing inventory of the domestic like product declined significantly during the last year of POR . This decrease was primarily caused by a sharp drop in production and sales of domestic like product, driven by a substantial reduction in domestic demand of domestic like product in domestic market.
- 23.9.3 Termination of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries would likely lead to increase in its volume, which would negatively affect production and sales of the domestic like product. Therefore, termination of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets would negatively affect inventories of the domestic like product of the domestic industry.
- 23.9.4 On the basis of the above information and analysis, there is a likelihood of a significant increase in the volume of imports of the product under review if anti-dumping duty is removed, therefore, there is a likelihood that the domestic industry may experience a decline in sales of the domestic like product, resulting in adverse effects, including increased inventories.

#### 23.10 Likely Effect on Employment, Productivity and Wages

23.10.1 The information regarding employment in the domestic industry, productivity per worker and salaries & wages paid for production of the domestic like product is given in the following table:

Table – XVIII
Applicants' Employment, Productivity and Wages

| Year/Period     | Number of<br>Employees | Salaries &<br>Wages<br>(Value) | Production<br>(Volume) | Productivity (per worker) | Salaries &<br>wages<br>(per MT) |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------------|
| (1)             | (2)                    | (3)                            | (4)                    | (5)                       | (6)                             |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 100                    | 100                            | 100                    | 100                       | 100                             |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 105                    | 133                            | 103                    | 99                        | 128                             |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 105                    | 143                            | 68                     | 64                        | 212                             |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 97                     | 135                            | 36                     | 37                        | 372                             |

\* POI of Original Investigation

Sources: the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures are indexed by taking figures in Jan 18-Dec 18 equals to 100.

23.10.2 The above table shows that after imposition of anti-dumping duty, the number of employees increased during the first two years of the POR compared to the POI of the original investigation. However, employment declined in the final year of the POR, aligning with a decrease in production and capacity utilization (paragraph 23.7 supra). Despite this, salaries and wages per MT increased throughout the POR. Production of the domestic like product decreased during the second and the last year of the POR,

resultantly productivity per worker decreased and salaries & wages per unit of output of the domestic like product increased during the POR.

23.10.3 As there is likelihood of significant increase in volume of imports of the product under review if anti-dumping duty is terminated (paragraph 23.4 supra), which will adversely affect sales and market share of the domestic industry (paragraph 23.6 supra), therefore, there is strong likelihood of decline in production and capacity utilization of the domestic industry (paragraph 23.7 supra), therefore, there is likelihood of decline in productivity and increase in per MT salaries & wages if antidumping duty on dumped imports of the product under review is terminated.

#### 23.11 Likely Effect on Investment and Return on Investment

23.11.1 As the Applicant are a multi-product companies, therefore, investment and return on investment of the Applicants are determined for whole companies as it cannot be determined separately for each product. The information regarding the return on investment of the Applicants during original POI and the POR is given in the following table:

Table – XIX
Applicants' Return on Investment

| Year/Period     | Return on investment (%) |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| (1)             | (2)                      |
| Jan 18-Dec 18*  | 19.33                    |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21 | 50.04                    |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22 | 9.85                     |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23 | 10.70                    |

<sup>\*</sup> POI of Original Investigation

Sources: the Applicants

- 23.11.2 The table above indicates that the domestic industry's investment and return on investment (ROI) increased significantly during the first year of the POR. According to the Applicants, this increase was driven by government measures that discouraged imports, allowing the domestic industry to achieve substantial profits. Additionally, advance purchases of raw materials and rising steel prices further contributed to higher profitability between October 2020 and September 2021, leading to a notable surge in ROI. However, in the second and last years of the POR, economic crises in Pakistan impacted the industry's profitability. Despite these challenges, the domestic industry managed to maintain a positive return on investment.
- 23.11.3 As termination of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports from the Exporting Countries would likely lead to an increase in volume of dumped imports of the product under review, therefore, there is a likelihood that the domestic industry would be forced to reduce production, sales, and sales price of the domestic like product. This situation will likely further affect adversely the return on investment of the domestic industry.

23.11.4 On the basis of the above information and analysis it is concluded that the domestic industry is likely to face injury on account of return on investment on termination of anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries.

#### 23.12 Likely Effects on Cash Flow

23.12.1 The Applicants are multi-product companies and the cash flows for different products cannot be determined separately as number of factors are combined for all products. Therefore, total net cash flow of the entire operations of the Applicants for the POR is given in the following table:

Table – XX Applicants' Cash Flows

| Year             | Cash Flows<br>(Value) |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| (1)              | (2)                   |
| Jan 18 - Dec 18* | (100)                 |
| Oct 20 - Sep 21  | 20                    |
| Oct 21 - Sep 22  | (148)                 |
| Oct 22 - Sep 23  | 514                   |

\* POI of Original Investigation Sources: the Applicants

Note: In order to maintain confidentiality, actual figures are indexed by taking figure in Jan 18 - Dec 18 equals to 100

- 23.12.2 It is evident from the above table that the cash flow of the domestic industry improved significantly after the imposition of an anti-dumping duty. However, the domestic industry's net cash flows from its operations deteriorated sharply and became negative during the second year of POR. Analysis of the information has shown that the slowdown of the economy increased the inventory in hand in the Company's books negatively effecting the cash generated from operations closing at negative.
- 23.12.3 As there is likelihood of adverse/ negative effects on production, sales and prices of the domestic like product due to termination of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports of the product under review, therefore, there is likelihood of adversely effect on cash flows of the domestic industry if anti-dumping duty is terminated on dumped imports of the product under review.

#### 23.13 Likely Effects on Growth and Investment

23.13.1 After imposition of anti-dumping duty on CR Coils/Sheets, the domestic industry's installed production capacity has significantly increased after the imposition of anti-dumping duty on dumped imports of the product under review (paragraph 23.7). This shows significant growth in the domestic industry and its improved ability to raise capital for investment as a result of the imposition of anti-dumping duty on the product under review. As there is a likelihood of a significant increase in the volume of dumped imports of the product under review, which will adversely affect sales volume, prices, profits, and

profitability of the domestic like product, therefore, there is a likelihood of adverse effects on growth and ability to raise capital of the domestic industry if anti-dumping duty on dumped imports of the product under review is removed.

# 23.14 Changes in market conditions in the economy of Pakistan and internationally, including changes in the supply of and demand for the imports of the product under review

- 23.14.1 According to the Economic Survey 2023-24, iron & steel sector posted a negative growth of 2.2 percent during 2022-23. The flat steel/strips/coils/plates experienced a negative growth of 2.1 percent. The steel industry faces multiple challenges, including elevated energy costs, significant dependence on imported raw materials, and the threat of dumped imported steel products. The low demand from complementary industries such as automobiles, electrical equipment, heavy machinery etc., has led to underutilization of flat steel products including the product under review.
- 23.4.2 As there is likelihood of significant increase in volume of imports of the product under review if anti-dumping duty is terminated (paragraph 23.4 supra), therefore, there is a likelihood that the domestic industry struggles to compete with the dumped imports, potentially reducing production, market share, employment and profitability. This weakens the domestic industry and increases reliance on dumped imports, making the market more vulnerable to global price fluctuations and supply chain disruptions.

#### 23.15 **Summing up Likely Recurrence or Continuation of Injury**

On the basis of information and analysis at preceding paragraphs the Commission has reached on conclusion that termination of anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries would likely lead to recurrence of injury to the domestic industry on account of the following:

- (a) Likely increased volume of dumped imports of the product under review from the Exporting Countries;
- (b) Likely price undercutting, price depression and price suppression;
- (c) Likely decline in production, capacity utilization, sales and market share of the domestic like product; and
- (d) Likely negative effect on profits, inventories, ROI, employment, cashflows and productivity of the domestic industry.

#### D. <u>CONCLUSIONS</u>

- 24. After taking into account all the information, data and analysis the Commission has reached at the following conclusions:
  - (a) The domestic industry filed an application for sunset review of anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of the product under review from the Exporting Countries within prescribed time-period in accordance with Section 58(3) of the Act in response to the notice of impending expiry of the anti-dumping duty. The application requirements of Sections 24 and 48 of the Act and Rule 32 of the Rules.
  - (b) There is likelihood of recurrence of dumping of the product under review from the Exporting Countries if anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of the product under review is terminated.
  - (c) Termination of anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of the product under review from the Exporting Countries will likely increase in volume of dumped imports, thus there is likelihood of recurrence of injury to the domestic industry on accounts of price undercutting, price depression, price suppression, decline in domestic industry's production, capacity utilization sales, market share and adverse effect on profits, inventories, return on investment (ROI), employment and productivity of the domestic industry.

#### E. CONTINUATION OF DEFINITIVE ANTI-DUMPING DUTY

- 25. In terms of Section 58(3) of the Act, definitive anti-dumping duty shall not expire if the Commission determines in the review that the expiry of such anti-dumping duty would likely to lead to continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury.
- 26. In view of the information, analysis and conclusions in preceding paragraphs, the Commission has determined that the expiry of anti-dumping duty imposed on dumped imports of the product under review would be likely to lead to recurrence of dumping and injury to the domestic industry. The Commission has, therefore, decided to continue anti-dumping duty at the rate of 13.94 percent in *ad val* terms on dumped imports of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries for a further period of five years effective from September 20, 2024.
- 27. In accordance with Section 51 of the Act, the anti-dumping duty shall take the form of ad valorem duty and would be deposited in National Tariff Commission's Non-lapsable PLD head of account "G11217 Personal Deposits" maintained with the State Bank of Pakistan. The definitive anti-dumping duty would be collected in the same manner as customs duty is collected. Release of the dumped imports of the product under review for free circulation in Pakistan shall be subject to imposition of such anti-dumping duty.

- 28. Further, in accordance with Section 51(1)(ea) of the Act, definitive anti-dumping shall not be levied on imports of the product under review that are used as inputs in products destined solely for exports or for use in the foreign grant-in-aid projects and are covered under any scheme exempting customs duties for exports or foreign grant-in-aid projects under the Customs Act, 1969 (IV of 1969).
- 29. Definitive anti-dumping duty levied would be in addition to other taxes and duties leviable on import of the product under review under any other law.

(Ahmed Sheraz) Member March 14, 2025 (Imran Zia) Member March 14, 2025

(Muhammad Iqbal Tabish) Member March 14, 2025 (Naeem Anwar) Chairman March 14, 2025

#### Annex-I

#### Comments of Interested Parties

#### **NTC View**

#### Views/Comments of Karachi Iron & Steel Merchants Association

"The applicants have relationship with the exporters of the investigated product under review, as they have imported themselves in November 2021, during the period of review, their raw material of Hot Rolled Coils from Russia, quantities being 2059.249 MT and 2971.021 MT, imported by International Steels Limited vide GD no. KEWB-MB-8496-26-11-2021 and Aisha Steel Mills Limited also imported Hot Rolled Coils from Russia, quantity being 2000.900 MT in the very same month/period. vide GD no. KEWB-HC-8562-29-11-2021, further to this, International Steels Limited also imported Hot Rolled Coils from Russia in February 2022, quantities being 3926.980 MT and 986.440 MT vide GD no. PQIB-HC-12472-12-02-2022. For the period of original investigation, which was January 2016 to December 2018, International Steels Limited has imported Cold Rolled Coils, the product under review from Russia itself, 34838.57 MT was imported in April 2016, video GD no. KEAP-IB-1515-21-04-2016, while 9683.410 MT was imported in April 2018, vide GD no. KEAP-IB-3019-10-04-2018. Aisha Steel Mills limited have been importing Hot Rolled Coils from Russia even before the imposition of anti-dumping duties for which the current review in underway, where they imported 9786.10 MT in January 2019, similarly International Steels Limited also imported Hot Rolled Coils from Russia in the very same month/period 9936.130 MT. The National Tariff Commission, has been negating and having a disdain attitude towards this issue, which has already been highlighted to it on several occasions i.e. in course of various investigations as well as review investigations, where the applicant(s) International Steels Limited and Aisha Steel Mills Limited have had relationship with both the importers and exporters of the product being investigated or reviewed but the Commission has never accepted the importers or their associations this point where they were registered as interested parties."

The findings and determination made during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Antidumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past matter.

Furthermore, refer to Section 2(d) of the Act that defines the domestic industry also outlines the requirements of the relationship in the context of this law relevant exact of Section 2(d) is as follows:

- ".... For the purposes of this clause, producers shall be deemed to be related to exporters or importers only if;
- i. one of them directly or indirectly controls the other;
- ii. both of them are directly or indirectly controlled by the same third person; or
- iii. together they directly or indirectly control a third person; ......"

In view of the above, importing products which may include raw materials do not mean that there is a relationship between two entities. Besides, the domestic industry did not import the product under review during the POR. Neither do they have any relationship with the exporters as per Section 2(d) of the Act, which can be verified through the financials of the Applicants available in public domain being public limited companies.

"The anti-dumping duties imposed on Cold Rolled Steel Coils/ Sheets into Pakistan originating in and/or exported from the Canada and the Russian Federation, were illegal and illegitimate, as there stands no hesitation in mentioning that in the initial and original investigation the Commission has not verified the adequacy and accuracy of the information received from the applicants as while reviewing the public file and all relevant documents there could be many weaknesses and flaws found in the statements of applicants as well as findings of the Commission such as the investigated product, domestic like product, like product and their relevant PCT does produced or processed by the applicants or the so called domestic industry, those produced and shipped by the exporting countries in the said investigation, customs tariff structure, dumping & evidence of dumping, dumping margins, volume of alleged dumped imports, material injury to the domestic industry, price effects (price undercutting, price depression & price suppression) and all other relevant factors covered by the Commission. in the said investigation."

The findings and determination during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Anti-Dumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past matter.

"At the time of Original investigation, it was also proven to the Commission that the grades as made and produced by the exporting countries Canada and Russia are not domestically produced by the applicants/domestic industry, but the Commission did not give any importance to the same, nor widths were limited nor thicknesses, while Canada was already exporting below negligible volume, and Russia was exporting above its normal whereas the price undercutting, price suppression and price depression all had erroneous values."

The findings and determination during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Anti-dumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past matter.

"At the time of Original investigation, the Commission also did not exclude from the scope of investigation the grades, sizes and thicknesses, which the domestic industry is not able to supply or produce, but only excluded grades which were imported by auto industry, prime quality TMBP below and 0.30 mm thickness and not secondary, however catalogs, brochures, and all the relevant information was supplied to the Commission in much comprehensive manner."

"If the Commission is having even 1% sense of honesty, it should read all those before giving any conclusions or statements, the Commission must also note that the association(s) have already been part of so many investigations that it has no faith left in Commission's ability or performance, and it seems that all of the Commission's personnel are involved in malpractices where they come to gets illegal benefits using their power in the Commission, they are not equitable in approach with the importers or anyone else other than applicants, just to have financial gains from them, therefore the association(s) would never want to join such a Commission in any investigation or review, however since the importers stake is it at risk, it would have to without even wanting to do so."

The Commission has taken a lenient view of the interest party's demeaning remarks. The baseless accusations and smearing leveled against the Commission and its personnel lack any substantive proof and do not merit further engagement.

"The Commission insists on protecting the so called domestic industry, which is almost all the cover and making billions of rupees in profit, it

-do-

can only be said that the personnel in the Commission from top to bottom are not sincere with Pakistan themselves and have their personal interests favoring the applicants, which they know better how much the same is but there is no other thought one can have in mind."

"The import quantities when individually counted from the exporting countries remained well below the negligible volume of imports as per Section 41-3(b) of the Act, which the Commission disregarded during the original investigation for Canada as the exporting country and the applicants and their consultants are as usual giving misguiding statements and numbers in their application to this review by combining quantities from both the exporting countries to show a larger quantity impact in terms of percentages against total imports to illegally once again get the anti-dumping duties continued, where only in the second year of POR the quantities from Russia are higher than the negligible volume but not in the first year of POR nor in the last year of POR, as far as Canada is concerned during the whole POR, the quantities from Canada have been well below the negligible volume of 3% amongst total imports."

As far as findings and determination during the original investigation are concerned, that are not subject to investigation during the review proceedings.

However, in the Sunset review conducted under Section 58 of the Act, legal obligation is to analyze or assess the likelihood of recurrence of injury if anti-dumping duties in place are terminated. Therefore, it is not required by law that injury factors such as volume of dumped imports must be significant in order to continue the anti-dumping measures imposed.

Refer to the Anti-Dumping Duties Act, 2015 for more details.

".....the only share in a shrinking market is increasing is that of the applicants, which was bound to happen, where the applicants were forcefully with the help of the Commission were able to get imposed unlawful and lawbreaking antidumping duties on sources one after the other, firstly it was China & Ukraine, followed by Russia & Canada and then it was 3 countries and a region altogether, being for South Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam & EU. In such an economic scenario which Pakistan faces, it is imperative and a must do thing for the Commission to firstly close such units of production like that of applicants who not just give serious negative impact on foreign currency reserves disturbing the country's balance of payments but also give nothing in return to the country."

In sunset reviews conducted under Section 58 of the Act, legal obligation is to analyze or assess the likelihood of recurrence of injury if anti-dumping duties in place are terminated. Therefore, it is not required by law that injury factors such as market share must be negatively affected in order to continue the anti-dumping measures imposed. The obligations for determination of injury in sunset review are different than those of original investigation.

"....In the first year of POR, October 2020 to September 2021, they increased their prices by about 53%, increasing all the time of the year and increasing 20 times throughout the year, increasing prices 3 times in a month was very common and up to 4 times the prices were increased in a month's time, in the second year of POR, October 2021 to September 2022, they increased their prices by over 14%, increasing 13 times and decreasing only twice, increasing prices 2 to 3 times in a month was very common, in the last year of POR, October 2022 to September 2023, they increased their prices by over 18%, increasing 8 times and decreasing only thrice, increasing prices 2 times in a month was very common and up to 4 times the prices were increased in a

Increasing the prices of domestic like product is up to the domestic producers. Price is usually set by keeping in view the supply and demand situation. In case the buyers are not satisfied by the the domestic prices set by producers, they are free to import from non-dumped sources of from sources dumped by paying antidumping duties.

month's time, yet the applicants have to claim about dumping being done in Pakistan, where they are able to increase their prices at their will and disposal."

"The applicants did not faced any price suppression in the second year of POR. October 2021 to September 2022, where their import prices of raw material HRC were as high as USD 1096 per MT in the first guarter of the second year of POR, their import prices of raw material HRC prices reduced to USD 640 per MT in the last guarter of the second year of POR, which is a reduction of over 41.50%, where USD appreciated against PKR by 34.50% about, however in the second last year of the POR they were able to increase their prices by over 14%, thus giving them the advantage of over 21% in increasing their prices then their cost, therefore no price suppression can be claimed by them. In the last year of POR, October 2022 to September 2023, imports from Canada did not decrease but were increased to 897.467 MT compared to the second year of POR, October 2021 to September 2022, where they were 486.869 MT only, further the share of Canadian imported material amongst all imports was 1.15% in the last year of POR, which is only 0.442% in the second last year of POR."

The Commission has considered the price effects in the light of legal obligations set out at Section 58 of the Act, while concluding this review investigation.

Please refer to para 23.3 of the Conclusion report

"Aisha Steel Mills Limited reports in its financials of 2016 annual profit in negative i.e. loss of PKR 155,000,000, in the year 2017 it reports its profits at PKR 1,020,000,000 as they came out of loss and thus increasing by over 750%, in the year 2018 it reports its profits at PKR 1,284,000,000 i.e. about 116% of last year 2018. International Steels Limited reports in its financials of 2021 annual profit at PKR 7,466,331,000, in the year 2022 it reports its profits at PKR 5,412,190,000 lastly in the year 2023 it reports its profits at PKR 3,518,790,000. Aisha Steel Mills Limited reports in its financials of 2021 annual profit at PKR 6,368,000,000, in the year 2022 it reports its profits at PKR 1,146,000,000 lastly in the year 2023 it reports its losses at PKR 3,216,000,000. Thus, the net profit of the applicants during the POI kept increasing by 340% in the second year of POI and by 39% in the last year of POI, which decreased in the second year of POR by 52.59% and further decreased by over 95% in the last year of POR. The applicants already have a cover of 18% on account of customs duties, regulatory duties and additional customs duties, as regards to prime quality materials, whereas on secondary quality materials, they have a cover of 31% on account of customs duties, regulatory duties and additional customs duties, where the applicants don't pay any such duties, they have a further advantage of taxes, where they only pay sales tax on the value of their imports and not on the value of their sales."

The findings and determination during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Anti-dumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past transaction.

However, in the context of sunset review that the Commission carries out in depth analysis of the injury factors including the profitability which is product specific and are reported in the Commission's onthe-spot verification/investigation reports and are made part of the Commission's report on conclusion of sunset reviews.

"The false assertions made by the applicants and their consultants should be noted here by the Commission, where cash flow in the second year of the POR is even more negative than the original POI, was also negative in the last year of POR, as per table-10 of the application, but it was highly positive in the last year of POR, but the applicants claim

Please refer to para 23.12 of this report for analysis and conclusion on the cashflows.

that it has been due to the imposition of anti-dumping duties on Canada and Russia, whereas the truth is that the market size declined, leading to less demand of Cold Rolled materials, where the applicants having stocks in hand and imports being less they were able to sell more in the decreasing market size and gain more share, leading to more cash flows, though if anti-dumping duties were to help the applicants, cash flow would have stayed positive in the first and second year of POR as well."

"In table-11 of the application shows that salaries and wages per MT in the last year of POR has increased, whereas the productivity per worker decreased because production decreased, reasons for decrease in production is market size contraction."

Refer to para 23.12 of the report for analysis on employment, salaries & wages and productivity.

"The numbers shown in table-12 of the application are all positive, with an increase in fixed assets by 5% about from the first year of POR to second year of POR, and increase by 3.89% in the last year of POR, though negative figures are shown for the first year, but an increase of PKR 4,074 million is there for the whole POR, thus the results from the production and sales of the domestic like product have contributed to the applicants/domestic industry's growth."

"The applicants were able to increase their capacities and exist profitably in the market of Pakistan, increasing investments from time to time, thriving on the cost of a common man and country as a whole, giving losses in terms of duties and taxes as well as foreign exchange."

"Their return on investment would not be affected with or without antidumping duties being imposed, the figures in table-13 of the application are indicators as the domestic market seen decline, where it can also be seen that return on investment in the second year of POR and the last year of POR was even less than that of original POI by over 60%, thus confirming that anti-dumping duties being illicitly and feloniously imposed by the Commission did not helped the applicants to gain more returns on investment, nor any continuation of such unwarranted duties would help the applicants to earn more returns."

".... the applicants and their consultants have provided normal values from Canada and Russia in annexure-F of the application only for the month of June 2023 ex MEPS International of UK for Canadian originated Cold Rolled steel, for Russian originated Cold Rolled steel the applicants have mentioned that they have taken normal values from Fast markets Global Limited, however none of the same can be found in the public file in annexures, attachments or appendices submitted by the applicants/their consultants to the Commission, where while responding to the Commission on 15th January 2024, the applicants consultant have mentioned that the same are presented in attachment-V but the same are not found, but only proof of VAT on Russian supplies is given in attachment-V, an email was sent to the Commission regarding this and other shortcomings in the public file on 25th June

Section 58 of the Act, the impact of anti-dumping duties imposed on injury factors are analyzed to assess the likelihood of recurrence of injury if anti-dumping duties in place are terminated. Therefore, it is not required by law that injury factors such as growth and investments must be negatively affected in order to continue the anti-dumping measures already in place.

The Commission has taken lenient view of the interest party's demeaning remarks. The baseless allegations of felony and illicit practices lack any substantive proof and do not merit further engagement.

Extracts of "MEPS International" of UK for North American originated Cold Rolled Steel are available in the Public file. While the Applicant has submitted the evidence of normal value for Russian origin Cold Rolled steel i.e. Fast Market Global Limited subject to confidentially citing the reason that the same cannot be shared in public domain per the terms of paid subscription.

2024 and a reminder was sent on 26th June 2024, but no response received from the Commission, it must also be noted that all these bulletins and price publishers give price indications only and not actual transactional values, further the Commission has also not made any efforts to acquire values from any other sources to verify the same, thus no independent research effort can be seen from the Commissions end."

"The normal value of Canada as given in annexure-G of the application cannot be relied upon, as only secondary materials were imported from Canada during the whole of POR as well as whole of POI and none of it was prime, where during whole of POR most quantities were of TMBP material and not Cold Rolled steel material, which the Commission has already excluded from the scope of investigation and review in other investigations."

The applicants have considered freights from moversDB.com, which only gives container prices, whether the same are accurate or not is an entirely separate discussion but all the materials coming from Russia were by bulk mode and not through container, it is not possible that the applicants are unaware of this as they themselves have imported from Russia, not just their raw material Hot Rolled steel during the POR but in POI as well, where they have also imported the product under review Cold Rolled steel during the POI by bulk mode, such a question has not been raised by the Commission as well, which indicates the Commission's dependency on the information given by the applicants, therefore the Commission should not claim that they follow the Act, as they do not seek the best information available but only that which is provided by the applicants.

"The applicants and their consultants have also not calculated the duty drawback or the export rebate or VAT the Russian or Canadian exporters may have received against their exports, because of which the applicant's calculation of normal value is faulty."

TMBP and CR Coils/sheet of prime or secondary quality are product under review as defined during the original investigation. As per Section 58 of the Act, the Commission is only reviewing the measures imposed against the product under review. Further, please refer to para 13 of the report regarding the product under review.

The Commission afforded opportunity to provide such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and comprehensive exporters questionnaire was sent. However, no response and tangible evidence was provided to the Commission. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provisions of the Act.

Besides, this sunset review is not revising the margins of anti-dumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

The exporters from Russia and Canada have not provided requisite information on the exporter's questionnaire. Exporter's data is critical to determination of dumping margins which is not before the Commission in this sunset review due to lack of cooperation. Furthermore, the Commission does not intend to modify dumping

margins pursuant to this sunset review. "The application does not qualify under Anti-Dumping Duties Act, as per Upon examination of the section 20-2(b) of the Act, where the applicants are unable to prove or application, the Commission provide evidences of any dumping, injury or causal link cause to thereof established that met it the reasons." requirements of Section 58 of the Act and Rule 32 of the Rules. Therefore, the Commission initiated sunset review to determine whether there is likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping of CR Coils/Sheets from the Exporting Countries and injury to the domestic industry. "The anti-dumping duties imposed on Cold Rolled Steel Coils/ Sheets The findings and determination into Pakistan originating in and/or exported from the Canada and during the original investigation are Russian Federation, at the rate of 13.94% were illegal and illegitimate, final and have not been challenged as per Section 4 of the Act, a product is considered to be dumped if it is by any interested party on this ground introduced into the Commerce of Pakistan at a price, which is less than the Anti-Dumping in Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a its normal value, however the applicants applications and the Commissions working has not proved the same for the original closed and past matter. investigation." "Section 41(3) of the Act provides that the dumped imports shall As far as findings and determination normally be regarded as negligible if the volume of dumped imports of during the original investigation are an investigated product is found to account for less than three percent concerned, that are not subject to of total imports of a like product unless imports of the investigated investigation during the review product from all countries under investigation which individually account proceedings. for less than three percent of the total imports of a like product collectively account for more than seven per cent of the imports of like In the sunset review proceedings, product, however the imports data available to us reveals that the the Commission is not under quantities imported during the POI from Canada were below the obligation to determine negligible negligible volume during the original POI, during POR and below volume threshold from the exporting negligible volume from Russia during POR." countries. "The Rule 32 (a) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules 2022 mentions that The interested party has the application should be made by a domestic industry, however the misinterpreted the term applicants does not qualify for the domestic industry as already "relationship" in the context of explained in our response to the applicants application to sunset review, applicable law. Limiting the imports where the applicants are controlling the importers by requesting for antiby way of imposition of antidumping duties does not by any dumping duties to be imposed, on the other hand buying its raw material Hot Rolled Coils during the period of review and original period of means control the importers. Refer investigation from Russian exporters POR as well as importing the to Section 2(d) of the Act that investigated product Cold Rolled steel themselves from the exporting defines the domestic industry also countries during the original POI, who were also exporters of the outlines the requirements of the investigated product, thus controlling them by not allowing exporters to relationship in the context of this law

sell their product of Cold Rolled steel to Pakistan but importing itself its

required or raw materials and the product under review from the very

relevant exact of Section 2(d) is as

follows:

same exporters, the same was the case during the original investigation and the same is the case during the POR."

"As per Rule 36 (2) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules 2022, the applicants does not qualify under Section 2(d) of the Act, 2015, as the applicants is in relation with the exporters and the importers, controlling both the exporters to export to Pakistan and controlling importers by importing into Pakistan, hence the applicants are not a domestic industry, and the applicants does not qualify for Section 24 of the Act where have given false and less information to the Commission."

".... For the purposes of this clause, producers shall be deemed to be related to exporters or importers only if;

i. one of them directly or indirectly controls the other;

ii. both of them are directly or indirectly controlled by the same third person; or

iii. together they directly or indirectly control a third person;

....."

In view of the above, importing products which may include raw materials do not mean that there is a relationship between two entities. Besides, the domestic industry did not import product under review during the POR. Neither do they have any relationship with the exporters as per Section 2(d) of the Act, which can be verified through financials of the Applicants available in public domain being public limited companies.

"As per section 32(c) of the Rules, the normal value from both the exporting countries i.e. Canada and Russian Federation on account of secondary quality Cold Rolled Steel which is mostly exported/imported from the exporting countries during the period of review is not provided, whereas the construction of normal value of prime quality Cold Rolled Steel is full of errors."

In the final determination of original investigation, the Commission imposed lesser duty in terms of Section 50 (2) of the Act at the rate of 13.94% on both (primary and secondary) grades despite higher dumping margins on secondary grades. This indicates that the Commission has considered secondary quality and prime quality as a single product.

"As per the Rule 32 (e) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules 2022, the applicants have showed themselves in their application of sunset review that the exporters have reduced production whereas their exports have been constantly decreasing, not just to Pakistan but to other countries as well, so the application does not qualify for this point as well."

The Commission does not solely rely on the information provided in the application. Instead, it conducts thorough examination and analysis before reaching any conclusions in review а investigation. Additionally. the Commission examined the accuracy and adequacy of the information and evidence provided

in application in accordance with Rule 32 & 36 of Rules. "As per the Rule 32 (f) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules 2022, there Refer to para no. 23 of the are no likely affects on the applicant or the domestic industry due to Conclusion report. alleged dumped imports, which have been thoroughly explained in our response to the applicants" "As per the Rule 32 (g) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules 2022, the domestic industry's condition is all in all positive as compared to the original POI, in all perspectives." "As per the Rule 33 (d) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules 2022, the Rule 33 is the requirement of the applicants have failed to provide any exporter or producer anywhere in application for review under Section its sunset review application." 59 which does not apply to this case. The relevant requirements for "As per the Rule 33 (e) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Rules 2022, the this review are specified in Section applicants prices (normal values) sold for consumption in the country of 58 and further elaborated under origin is only provided for the month of June 2023, however upon Rule 32. The requirements for Commissions enquiry and with much reluctance the applicants have disclosure in the application of the provided same for the last year of POR only for Canadian origin Sunset Review under Section 58 products, where the same is not provided for secondary quality Cold are provided under Rule 33. Rolled steel as that is only quality imported into Pakistan during the original POI and POR and the more of secondary quality was imported from Russia than prime quality during the whole or POR, nor it is mentioned that the same is of which grade, whether that grade is being produced domestically or not, as already explained in the above paragraphs, moreover the constructed normal value is not as per clause (b) of the sub-section 1 of clause 6 of the Act, as the applicants have just assumed administrative, selling and general costs, to which no evidence is provided, whereas the freight calculation from Russia to Pakistan is also void, as shipment from Russia to Pakistan for the product under review is only by breakbulk and not containerized mode, as given by the applicants." "As per the Rule 33 (f) of the Anti Dumping Duties Rules 2022, information on export prices given by the applicants are faulty as the adjustments are not made in accordance with section 11 of the Act, nor the applicants has given any prices where its first re-sold to any independent buyer in Pakistan." "As per the Rule 33 (g) of the Anti Dumping Duties Rules 2022, information on evolution of imports of the product under review given by the applicants, cannot be considered as domestic like product and product under review are not like products, the domestic like product prices were not affected as the applicants/domestic industry increased its prices during the POR by over 85% about, which is i.e. increasing 42 different times, sometimes even 4 times within a month and decreased only 5 times during the whole POR, there was no negative effect on the applicants/domestic industry for the quantities of imports as there were only 1.15% of imports from Canada and only 2.20% from Russia amongst total imports during the last year of POR, whereas factors

listed in section 15, 16 and 17 were not to the applicants affect as per reasons given by the applicants itself in its annual reports, as it mentions for year 2022 a decrease of 16.5% in production leading to lesser sales over the previous year based on subdued demand in the local market, economy struggled due to its macroeconomic vulnerabilities and impact of higher commodity prices, depleting exchange reserves and widening current account deficit. With the rising global commodity prices, the current account deficit widened to USD 17 billion against USD 1.9 billion of last year. Rupee depreciated significantly by 31% to Rs. 205 to USD from Rs. 157 last year. Average inflation recorded as high as 12.15% against 8.9% of last year, post COVID surge in demand slowed down in the current year, the volumes declined by 14%, and further "increase of around 114% in the interest rates from 7% to 15% and introduction of 100% LC margin on HRC imports significantly increased the finance cost by 63% over last year. This increase was contained by effective inventory management and manufacturing costs. Extreme volatility in the exchange rate costed a net exchange loss of Rs. 617 million. Record high freight costs increased the freight expense by 52%. Furthermore, the imposition of a super tax of 10% in June 2022 on profits of the company further impacted the bottom line, whereas for the year 2023 its annual report mentions that domestic steel industry also witnessed a substantial 36% reduction in the market size on the back of eroding purchase power parity."

Aisha Steel Mills limited have been importing Hot Rolled Coils from Russia even before the imposition of anti-dumping duties for which the current review in underway, where they imported 9786.10 MT in January 2019, similarly International Steels Limited also imported Hot Rolled Coils from Russia in the very same month/period 9936.130 MT.

The applicants have requested to continue and re-impose definitive anti-dumping duties for the period of next 5 years on dumped imports of Cold Rolled Steel Coils/Sheets originating in and/or exported from Canada and Russian Federation to Pakistan, however the Commission cannot do the same, as the dumping was never done and the initially imposed anti-dumping duties were against the law and the Anti-Dumping Duties Act 2015, also there was no injury caused to the applicants, International Steels Limited, nor the discontinuation of the illegally imposed anti-dumping duties would cause any injury to the current applicants, International Steels Limited and Aisha Steel Mills Limited, the same would be further explained in detail in this document.

The applicants always refer in all of their applications providing name of countries who have already imposed anti-dumping duties or other protective measures against the exporting country in any given case, however the applicants cannot report even a single country other than Pakistan, where the applicants or the so called domestic industry having relationship with the exporters and importers as well as importing the dumped products itself is being considered as the domestic industry, its

The findings and determination during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Anti-Dumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past matter.

The product under review is CR Coils Sheet. Whereas Hot Rolled Coils do not fall within the scope of product under review.

Refer to Section 2(d) of the Act that defines the domestic industry also outlines the requirements of the relationship in the context of this law relevant exact of Section 2(d) is as follows:

".... For the purposes of this clause, producers shall be deemed to be related to exporters or importers only if;

only happening in Pakistan with the help of the Commission and the National Tariff Commission being only authority across the globe who is entertaining such illegalities that such applicants or domestic producers are considered as domestic industry, which goes against the guidelines of WTO as well.

The application does not fulfill the requirement of Section 24 of the Act as the applicants International Steels Limited and Aisha Steel Mills Limited have given false and misleading information to the Commission."

 i. one of them directly or indirectly controls the other;

ii. both of them are directly or indirectly controlled by the same third person; or

iii. together they directly or indirectly control a third person;

. . . . . . .

"During the course of original investigation, it was informed to the Commission by our member and importer M/S Safa Steel, that the applicants are only producing limited product range and producing the product under review under which HS/PCT code and not producing according, rather processing materials under the following: However, the Commission never excluded TMBP coils/sheets under PCT/HS code number 7209.1891 & 7209.1899 on the request of our member and importer M/S Safa Steel, but only did remove on the request of Siddigsons Pvt Ltd in ADC no. 35/2015/NTC/CRC/SSR/2020 and A.D.C No. 60/2021/NTC/CRC, where only prime quality materials were excluded from the scope of investigation/review and not secondary quality material, similarly other PCT/HS codes of 7209.1590, 7209.1510, 7209.2590, 7209.2510, 7209.1891, 7209.1899 and 7209.1810 were not removed from the scope of investigation nor the grades of the foreign producers from the exporting countries on the request of the registered interested party as an importer.

Further, a detailed comparison of what the applicant produces and how many grades are supplied by the exporting countries have already been submitted along with the producers/catalogs during the original POI as well as already submitted during the course of this review, which clearly shows that the domestic like product is far behind and below par in quality, thickness, widths and grades against the imported investigated product.

Moreover, the auto grades are being imported by the auto sector from Russia, unlike the applicants consultant claim that they only import from China, South Korea, Vietnam and Taiwan, details of their quantity of imports are already shared with the Commission, also Engineering Development Boards does not confirm that both the applicants or so called domestic producers are or can make TMBP."

"The total loss given by the applicants i.e. International Steel Limited and Aisha Steel Mills Limited during the period of review in terms of foreign exchange is a bit less than US dollars 1 billion, accounting to over USD 913,660,493.72/- or over USD 900 million and total loss to the national exchequer was PKR 59,828,549,726/-i.e. about PKR 60 billion."

As far as findings and determination during the original investigation are concerned, that are not subject to investigation during the review proceedings. The Commission has clearly defined investigated product while concluding this review and has defined the grades which are excluded from scope of this review. Further, the Commission determined that the domestic industry produced TMBP during POR.

The aspects are beyond the purview of this sunset review.

"The applicants have based the normal value of Cold Rolled steel coils/sheets in Canada based on MEPS International of UK, however they are not representing only Canadian values but US/NAFTA values which are very high in comparison to Canadian prices itself, otherwise the most exports made by Canadian exporters of Cold Rolled steel would definitely not be USA as shown by the applicants in their application to the Commission themselves, moreover all imports during the original POI as well as during the POR were of secondary materials only from Canada, whose price cannot be determined through any publisher, as firstly no publisher in the world publishes original transaction prices of secondary steel nor estimated prices, secondly secondary steel prices have their own mechanism and depends mainly on the defect or the quality of the material, together with thickness/widths, specifications to reach a price, origin wise prices are also different, whereas secondary prices are mainly depended if the steel factories of any country allow the local sale of the same, most importantly it is the bargain power of both the seller and buyer which determines secondary steel prices.

The applicants have based the normal value of Cold Rolled steel coils/sheets in Russia based on Fastmarkets Global Limited of UK, which are not actual values but representing and reference values only as the Fastmarkets states itself under point no. 3 titled scope of services on page no. 3, they clearly state that the values provided are for general information only, therefore no reliance can be made on the same, as it does not promise accuracy of the content or information published. For the purpose of the original investigation, the Commission has reduced/discounted its constructed prices of prime quality for both Russian Federation and Canada by 26.66% by from the import prices available to them to reach the secondary quality prices, however such a practice is not seen by the Commission during this review investigation, nor the applicants have made any such adjustment, and the Commission is accepting the normal values as they are being submitted by the applicants, without any verification or due diligence, where any adjustment of VAT, duty draw back or GST can also not be seen in Canadian prices"

The Commission afforded the provide opportunity to such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and comprehensive exporters questionnaires were sent. However, no response and tangible evidence was provided to the Commission. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provision of the Act.

Besides, this sunset review is not revising the margins of antidumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

Regarding the separate dumping margins for primary and secondary grades, it may be noted that the Commission imposed a single antidumping duty rate on the basis of lessor duty for both the grade despite calculating higher dumping margin for secondary grade. Moreover, the Commission is not modifying the dumping margins. The likely dumping margin would be analyzed in this review.

Further, the Applicants have submitted the evidence of normal value for Russian origin Cold Rolled steel i.e. Fast Market Global Limited subject to confidentially citing the reason that the same cannot be shared in public domain as per the terms of paid subscription.

Refer to para 22.2 of the Conclusion Report.

"The applicants has taken freight rates from a US based company, not showing any date of the rate of freight but is general for the year 2023 where it last updated on October 13th 2023, which date is out of scope

The Commission afforded the opportunity to provide such information/evidence to all the

of review, however as it varies on daily basis, secondly, if the freight had to be taken by the applicants, the right approach would be to take from any forwarder in Canada or Russia or by any shipping agent in Pakistan but the applicants found it easier to take the same from a USA based which is not even a freight forwarder or shipping company but movers only, which is giving freight rates by 20' or 40' containers, though all of the product under review is shipped to Pakistan from Russia is by breakbulk and by 20' container for Canada, the Commission can see for itself in the imports data presented by us or the same available to it from PRAL, which it only shares with the applicants and not with the importers or their association, that all of the imports from Russia are done using breakbulk mode of shipment, where our presented imports data also shows the same as all of the entries ex Russia are of and KEWB (Karachi West Wharf Berth) for the product under review, it would have been much easier for the applicants to show its own imports data from Russia of Hot Rolled as they had imported 3926.980 MT and 986.440 MT from Russia in February 2022. Whenever comparing breakbulk freight and container freight from any origin to Pakistan, breakbulk freight is cheaper by 65-70%, therefore the likely export price for Russian originated steel would lead to.....

interested parties and importers and a comprehensive exporters questionnaires were sent. However, no response and tangible evidence was provided to the Commission. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provisions of the Act.

Besides, this sunset review is not revising the margins of antidumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

"..... no quantities were imported during the POR from Russia but materials came in only from Kazakhstan during the period, Kazakhstan only having seaports at Caspean sea which cannot be further shipped through sea and only by rail or road to Pakistan, so it is much cost affective to send materials via road to Russian seaports and from thereon by sea to Pakistan."

FBR's import data is used in the Commission's review / investigation represents the origin of imports after applying the requirements of certification or origin. Therefore, port of shipments, if different do not have any implication on the reporting of the origin.

"...... the Commission have considered imports ex Canada above de minimis levels, showing many imports from the PRAL data to be claimed ex Canada which in actual are not, as in many cases the imports are showing port of loading as different...."

The appendix-II of the application and table-2 on page no. 14 of the application, both show that the domestic market for the product under review is decreasing during the period of review, where the share of other producers like Hadeed Pakistan, MAB Steel and AHN Steel are all decreasing as well as share of Cold Rolled Steel from other markets which are luckily so far non dumped in the sight of the applicants is also reducing, share of imports from Russia and Canada is also decreasing, the same is situation for South Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam & EU, the only share in a shrinking market is increasing is that of the applicants, which was bound to happen, where the applicants were forcefully with the help of the Commission were able to get imposed unlawful and lawbreaking anti-dumping duties on sources one after the other, firstly it was China & Ukraine, followed by Russia & Canada and then it was 3 countries and a region altogether, being for South Korea, Taiwan, Vietnam & EU.

Although the total market has shrunk, the share of domestic industry has increased during POR showing the positive impact on imposition of antidumping duties.

"....In the first year of POR, October 2020 to September 2021, they increased their prices by about 53%, increasing all the time of the year and increasing 20 times throughout the year, increasing prices 3 times

Increasing the prices of domestic like product is up to the domestic producers. Price is usually set by in a month was very common and upto 4 times the prices were increased in a month's time, in the second year of POR, October 2021 to September 2022, they increased their prices by over 14%, increasing 13 times and decreasing only twice, increasing prices 2 to 3 times in a month was very common, in the last year of POR, October 2022 to September 2023, they increased their prices by over 18%, increasing 8 times and decreasing only thrice, increasing prices 2 times in a month was very common and upto 4 times the prices were increased in a month's time, yet the applicants have to claim about dumping being done in Pakistan, where they are able to increase their prices at their will and disposal."

keeping in view the supply and demand situation. In case the buyers are not satisfied by the prices set by the domestic producers, they are free to import from non-dumped sources of from dumped sources by paying antidumping duties.

"The applicants repetitively target Russian exporters that they are targeting Pakistan as an alternative market after facing sanctions from EU, Americas and other countries but if that would have been the case, more of Russian HRC would have landed into Pakistan but there were no imports after October 2022, also for Cold Rolled steel, last ever import was in June 2022, after which there had been no imports, this was an into bond entry, the import quantities we have from October 2022 to March 2023 from Russia for the last year of POR are all exbond entries, which confirms that no import was done from Russia of Cold Rolled steel after June 2022, if applicants statements were even 1% correct, imports from Russia would have flooded into Pakistan."

Hot Rolled Coils Steel (HRC) and Cold rolled coils/sheets (CRC) are two different products, HRC being an upstream industry's product is an input for downstream industry flat products such as CRC. Whereas, the Applicants are the user of Hot Rolled Coils Steel (HRC), which source its HRC from multiples sources which is not limited to only Russia. Besides, the market size of CRC has shrunk during the POR leading to lower imports of HRC.

"Without doubt the quantities from exporting countries have decreased during the POR than they were during the original POI, but the applicants are crumpling the main issue here, which is the market size contraction, where in first year of original POI, total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at 666,788.50 MT, the quantities in first year of POR stood at 166,332.757 MT, thus there were over 75% lesser imports in total, similarly in the second year of original POI total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at 362,398.697 MT, the quantities in second year of POR stood at 110,216.2428 MT, where about 70% lesser imports in total were seen and in the last year of original POI total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at 496.442.194 MT, the quantities in the last year of POR stood at 78,139.987 MT, which were over 84% less than the last year of original POI, therefore quantities from all origins decreased to much extent, not just from the exporting countries in the current case and anti-dumping duties could not be said an assistance to the same but the main reason was the market size."

Although the total market has shrunk, the share of domestic industry has increased during POR showing the positive impact on imposition of antidumping duties.

Disposable or an imminent/substantial increase in production capacity of the product subject to anti dumping duty by the exporting/foreign producer. The reference given by the applicant and their consultants of the OECD report, "Latest developments in steelmaking capacity-2023", shows the details of additional capacity planned in Canada and Russia, but all of the capacity enhancement is of EAF (Electric Arc Furnace), which is used mostly for the production of long products by the process of the melting scraps and not mainly for flat products, Russia's major

The Applicants have resorted to journals/publications for establishing their stance on this point. Journals/publications usually contain consolidated results. Importers have confronted the point that planned installed capacity of

and only flat steel producers are Magnitogorsk Iron and Steel Works, Novolipetsk Steel – NLMK and Severstal, there is no additional capacity reported in OECD report, flat steel producers of Canada only include Stelco Inc, Algoma Steel Inc and ArcelorMittal Dofasco of Canada, Algoma and Stelco were given governmental grants just to avoid bankruptcies, the main reason for which the Canadian government established this fund of C\$ 2 billion to assist Canadian steel industry was announced by the Canadian government that in a direct, measured and proportional response to the U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum, reciprocal surtaxes will be imposed on imports of steel. aluminum and other products from the United States and will come into effect on July 1, 2018, this fund was allocated to defend and protect the interests of Canadian workers and businesses in the steel, aluminum and manufacturing industries. The expansion at Algoma steel was for plate mill not for Cold Rolled steel, the article shared in annexure-I of the application for ArcelorMittal Canada steel plant relates to the expansion which is meant to be a transition away from BFBOF furnace steelmaking to the greener DRI-EAF production; it should reduce emissions at the plant by 60%, not to increase the production.

As already mentioned in the above paragraphs all the production expansions which the applicants and their consultants have referred to in their application and annexures have nothing to do with flat steel or the product under review Cold Rolled steel, as expansions in Russia in planning for none of those producers, who are producers of flat steel or particularly Cold Rolled steel, similar is the case with Canada where are the expansions are either for long steel producing units or plates, not for Cold Rolled steel, where the grants/subsidies provided to the steel producers in Canada by their government in retaliation against the tariffs imposed by USA, which is Canada's main market so their industry does not get the impact of the same.

As far as Russia is concerned, their government specially after the Russia-Ukraine war have imposed quotas and duties on export steel related items so locally the materials are available cheaper, and the processing units are occupied, please see Russian government orders annexed in annexure-7 to this document, thus this was also a reason as to why Russian imports in Pakistan have dropped in the last year, where Russian steel is being charged with export duties, our so called domestic industry or the applicants are worried asking to continue the illegitimate antidumping duties for another 5 years.

the exporters is of steel products not covered under this sunset review.

Please refer to para 22.3 of the Conclusion report. The Commission has examined the expansion of furnace capacity, which is, to a certain extent, related to the product under review.

# Views/Comments of Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation and the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation (Application & Hearing)

The Application states the following: "Removal of antidumping duties on Russian CRC exports to Pakistan could be disastrous as the domestic industry will not be able to compete with the highly dumped imports from Russia. This means there is a likelihood of continuation or reoccurrence of dumped imports from Russia if antidumping duties are removed. The applicant made such conclusion on the basis of the fact that due to

Rule 32 applies to the requirements of the application whereas Rule 40 and 41 applies to the determination of the Commission while concluding the sunset review investigation.

The Commission afforded the provide opportunity to such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and an exporters questionnaire was sent. However, no response was provided by the exporters. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provisions of the Act. Besides, this sunset review is not revising the margins of anti-dumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

The dumping margin of 6.64 % calculated by the Applicant, which is less than the current anti-dumping duty for Russian product of 13.94 %. In accordance with Article 1.1 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI GATT 1994 (hereinafter Anti-Dumping Agreement) "An anti-dumping duty shall remain in force only as long as and to the extent necessary to counteract dumping which is causing injury. Bearing this in mind, it appears to be unnecessary to continue the application of the anti-dumping duty of 13.94%".

The Commission afforded the opportunity to provide such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and an exporters questionnaire was sent. However, no response was provided by the exporters. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provisions of the Act. Besides, this sunset review is not revising the margins of anti-dumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

Besides this sunset review is not revising the margins of antidumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

The domestic industry of Pakistan had negative financial economic indicators during the POR......There are several facts that

In compliance of Section 58 of the Act and Rule 41 of the Rules, the

could injure the domestic industry. Such facts are not connected with imports from Russia. The Application informs of CQVID-19 related issues and economic challenges faced by Pakistan. High interest rates, lower purchasing power, higher taxation and lower disposable income contributed towards 63% reduction in the domestic demand in the last year of POR. Decrease of demand was caused by auto, construction sector, and electronics. In accordance with the UNCTAD's information, devastating floods of 2022 caused damages exceeding 30 billion dollars, about 8% of GDP of Pakistan. In this regard, the Russian side asked the authority to make additional analysis of the impact of the above-mentioned facts to the domestic industry.

Taking into account the above, the Russian side believes that there are no grounds for extending the anti-dumping measure and hopes that this review will be terminated without extending the measure.

impact of anti-dumping duties imposed on injury factors are analyzed to assess the likelihood of recurrence of injury to the domestic industry including changes in market conditions in the economy of Pakistan, if anti-dumping duties are expired.

Please refer to para 23 of the report.

#### Annex-II

#### **Comments of Interested Parties**

## NTC View

## Views/Comments of Karachi Iron & Steel Merchants Association (SEF)

"....The interested party(s) to this application or the applicants does have relationship with the exporters and products as well as Pakistani importers of the product under consideration. The applicants have relationship with the exporters of the investigated product under review, as they have imported themselves in November 2021, during the period of review, their raw material of Hot Rolled Coils from Russia, quantities being 2059.249 MT and 2971.021 MT, imported by International Steels Limited vide GD no. KEWB-MB-8496-26-11-2021 and Aisha Steel Mills Limited also imported Hot Rolled Coils from Russia, quantity being 2000.900 MT in the very same month/period, vide GD no. KEWB-HC-8562-29-11-2021, further to this, International Steels Limited also imported Hot Rolled Coils from Russia in February 2022, quantities being 3926.980 MT and 986.440 MT vide GD no. PQIB-HC-12472-12-02-2022.....The proofs and evidences apart from stated above have been presented to the Commission on several occasions but of no use, whether the applicants import investigated product or their raw materials, once they are engaged in the business with the exporters i.e. buying or importing from them or selling to the importers, a relationship is established, furthermore as per the definition of the Act, by selling to the importers, they are controlling them, as getting antidumping duties imposed means not allowing the importers to import into Pakistan and not allowing the exporters to export, at the very same instance the applicants not just import the investigated product i.e. in this case Cold Rolled Coils from the exporting country Russia but also their raw material of Hot Rolled Coils, in each of their application to the Commission the applicants deliberately lie about the same stating they do not have any relationship with the foreign exporters, producers and Pakistani importers of the product under investigation or review and the Commission blindly accepts their statements, turning a blind eye on the false statements of the applicants."

It was mentioned to the Commission in the sunset review investigation of Color Coated Coils/Sheets imported from People's Republic of China and South Africa, ADC No. 51/2017/NTC/CCC/SSR/2023 that in May 2022, during the period of review, their raw material of Hot Rolled Coils from a Chinese company named HANGZHOU CIEC GROUP CO, LTD, quantity being 1985.050 MT, also in the month of June 2022, the applicant has imported their raw material of Hot Rolled Coils from another Chinese company named SHANGHAI MEISHAN

The findings and determination made during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Antidumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past matter.

Furthermore, refer to Section 2(d) of the Act that defines the domestic industry also outlines the requirements of the relationship in the context of this law relevant exact of Section 2(d) is as follows:

- ".... For the purposes of this clause, producers shall be deemed to be related to exporters or importers only if;
- i. one of them directly or indirectly controls the other:
- ii. both of them are directly or indirectly controlled by the same third person; or
- iii. together they directly or indirectly control a third person;

......."

In view of the above, importing products which may include raw materials do not mean that there is a relationship between two entities. Besides, the domestic industry did not import the product under review during the POR. Neither do they have any relationship with the exporters as per Section 2(d) of the Act, which can be verified through the financials of the Applicants available in public domain being public limited companies.

The issue relates to the other investigation, which is out of the scope of the current review investigation.

IRON & STEEL CO., LTD., 751.510 MT and 721.660 MT, in July 2022 they imported from HUIJIN IMPORT AND EXPORT TRADE of China 9316.009 MT and in June 2023, they imported further quantities of 625.840 MT of Hot Rolled Coils from SHANGHAI MEISHAN **IRON** & STEEL CO.. LTD......During the initial/original investigation of Color Coated Coils/Sheets imported from People's Republic of China and South Africa, ADC NO. 51/2017/NTC/CCC/2017 the period of investigated was 1st January 2014 to 31st December 2016, and during the course of investigation, it was well informed to the Commission that the applicant has imported itself its raw material of Hot Rolled Coils from China during that period, the same was repeatedly mentioned in the documents presented by the association and its members, as well as shown on the multimedia projector on the date of hearing 20th March 2018 in presence of the then chairman Mr. Abdul Khaliq, but all went in vein as the ignored by the Commission and unconstitutional anti-dumping duties were imposed just on the basis of threat of material injury, though there was no material injury which was faced by the applicant.

Similarly in sunset review investigation of Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets imported from People's Republic of China and Ukraine A.D.C No. 35/2015/NTC/CCR/SSR/2020, it was informed that Aisha Steel Mills Limited have imported from BENXI IRON AND STEEL (GROUP) of China during the period of review in August 2018, as well as during the period which the anti-dumping duty was imposed i.e. January 2016 to December 2020. International Steels Limited have imported from PJSC ZAPORIZHSTAL FOR AND ON BEHALF OF METINVEST INTERNATIONAL S.A. of Ukraine during POR as well as from China and Ukraine during January 2016 to December 2020, also International Steels Limited have been importing Cold Rolled Steel Coils from INNER MONGOLIA BAOTOU STEEL UNION COMPANY LTD. TANGSHAN IRON AND STEEL GROUP and HUIJIN INDUSTRY (TIANJIN) CO. LTD.CHINA, investigated product during the POR as well as during the period of January 2016 to December 2020, all details and evidences were annexed with the response submitted to the Commission but use.....The was very much highlighted to the Commission by our member M/S Safa Steel in A.D.C No. 55/2019/NTC/CRC, antidumping duties investigation on Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets/Strips into Pakistan Originating in and/or Exported from Canada and the Russian Federation, where imports of International Steels Limited from Russia of the investigated product during the POI was shared with the Commission along with imports of their raw material Hot Rolled Steel from Russia during the POI, who was one of the applicant in that particular investigation. Without

The issue relates to the other sunset review investigation, which is out of the scope of the current review investigation.

However, the factor highlighted by Safa Steel regarding the imports of HRC from the Exporting Countries, the findings and determination made during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Anti-dumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past matter.

doubt the applicants, International Steels Limited and Aisha Steel Mills, have been selling to the importers during the period of review as they were selling to them during the original POI, however with the limited time given by the Commission to respond to multiple and many of the documents, the association is not mentioning the same, however it shall not be much difficult, but since the Commission hardly accepts anything which the association or the importers submits, there is no point wasting any time or efforts in the same, after all it's the Commission's job to check and verify the same, as well as apply all clauses of the Act on the applicant, as it does for the importers.

The applicants relationship with the importers have well been proved by giving the sales amount of the product under investigation and review in the sunset review investigation of Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets imported from People's Republic of China and Ukraine A.D.C No. 35/2015/NTC/CCR/SSR/2020, whether together with the sales volume, importers name and NTN numbers were also provided, also in the anti-dumping duties investigation of Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets imported from European Union, Taiwan, Vietnam and South Korea, A.D.C No. 60/2021/NTC/CRC, all such information was provided to the Commission, separately for the sales made by Aisha Steel Mills Limited and International Steels Limited to the importers during the period of investigation but all the hard work and research into the matter was wasted by the Commission just to illegally favor the applicants, thus proving the Commissions inability to conduct any investigation or review with a fair and honest approach......The Commission has given license to the applicants to import all their raw materials which is Hot Rolled Coils from the exporting countries under review and even import product under review which is Cold Rolled Steel materials, on the other hand the Commission helps the applicants by getting imposed illegal and unconstitutional antidumping duties so no importer could import from the exporting countries, which means that the Commission only wants the applicants to do business in Pakistan, who pay none of Custom Duties, Regulatory Duties and Additional Customs Duties, Sales Tax is only paid by them on the value of imported raw materials and difference or value added tax is not paid by them, whereas the applicants also pays minimum of income tax, but the Commission is against the importers who pay all of Custom Duties, Regulatory Duties and Additional Customs Duties, Sales Tax, Additional Sales Tax (Value Added Tax) and highest amount of Income Taxes.

The purpose of the statement of essential facts issued by the Commission in this investigation is hereby failed and is of no use, where the Commission has ignored all the facts presented by other interested parties including importers and importers Furthermore, refer to Section 2(d) of the Act that defines the domestic industry also outlines the requirements of the relationship in the context of this law relevant exact of Section 2(d) is as follows:

- ".... For the purposes of this clause, producers shall be deemed to be related to exporters or importers only if;
- i. one of them directly or indirectly controls the other:
- ii. both of them are directly or indirectly controlled by the same third person; or
- iii. together they directly or indirectly control a third person;

......."

In view of the above, importing products which may include raw materials do not mean that there is a relationship between two entities. Besides, the domestic industry did not import the product under review during the POR. Neither do they have any relationship with the exporters as per Section 2(d) of the Act, which can be verified through financials of the Applicants available in public domain being public limited companies.

The Commission has considered all views/comments as well as explanations provided by interested parties keeping in view relevant provisions of the Act, Rules.

the Antidumping Agreement and judgement of honorable Appellate Tribunal while concluding this sunset review.

The applicants does not fill the requirement of Section 24 of the Act, as the so called domestic industry/domestic producers are not producers of the investigated product as Pakistan Steel Mills Corporation is but they are entirely dependent on the imports of Hot Rolled Steel Coils as their raw material, which is just rerolled, cold reduced or processed by them, without which they would be shutting down their units of processing. The applicants has failed to provide any plentiful documentation to evidence as per the requirement of Section 20(b) of the Anti-Dumping Duties Act 2015 under Rule 3................................. therefore the application does not full the requirement of Section 24 of the Act as the Commission has failed to identify other producers or stakeholders of the industry only relied upon applicants information which was also misleading.

The application fulfils requirements of Section 24 of the Act and Rule 32 of the Rules, which allows the Commission to evaluate the standing of the domestic industry based on the level of support for or opposition to the application expressed by domestic producers of the like product. The application has been jointly submitted by M/s International Steels Limited, Karachi, and M/s Aisha Steel Mills Limited, Karachi, who collectively account for 84.79 percent of domestic production, as they are the major producers of CR Coils/Sheets in Pakistan. Therefore, the application meets the criteria established under Section 24 of the Act.

Rule 32 applies to the requirements of the application whereas Rule 40 and 41 applies to the determination of the Commission while concluding the sunset review investigation.

The Commission afforded the opportunity to provide such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and a comprehensive exporters questionnaire was sent. However, no response and tangible evidence was provided to the Commission. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provisions of the Act. Besides, this sunset review is not revising the margins of antidumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

The applicants have based the normal value of Cold Rolled steel coils/sheets in Russia based on Fastmarkets Global Limited of UK, which are not actual values but representing and reference

This sunset review is not revising the margins of anti-dumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other

values only as the Fastmarkets states itself under point no. 3 titled scope of services on page no. 3, they clearly state that the values provided are for general information only, therefore no reliance can be made on the same, as it does not promise accuracy of the content or information published, terms of use of Fastmarkets are attached in attachment no. 1 to this document. For the purpose of the original investigation, the Commission has reduced/discounted its constructed prices of prime quality for both Russian Federation and Canada by 26.66% by from the import prices available to them to reach the secondary quality prices, though most of the material imported from Russia during the POR is of secondary quality, however such a practice is not seen by the Commission during this review investigation, nor the applicants have made any such adjustment, and the Commission is accepting the normal values as they are being submitted by the applicants, without any verification or due diligence, this gives a serious doubt about Commission's ability to conduct such investigations, where it must also be mentioned that if the Commission discounts such a percentage, the same cannot be agreed upon as any fix percentage could not help reach normal value of secondary steel or any origin or in any country, which could vary but not limited to 20% to 60% of prime quality steel prices, other reasons are well explained in our response to the Commission against applicants application.

The Commission completely failed to examine and verify accuracy and adequacy of the evidence and information provided in the application in accordance with Section 23 of the Act and its determination was incorrect that there was sufficient evidence of dumping of Cold Rolled Steel Coils/ Sheets into Pakistan from exporting countries and consequent material injury to the domestic industry, as the Commission relied on the data of the applicants only and ignored the same given the importers and other interested parties, the investigated product and domestic like product are NOT by any means "like products" as the Commission claims it to be and there was no dumping done by the exporting countries as the normal values relied upon by the Commission was very unsteady and unactual, nor there was any injury to the so called domestic industry caused by the exports/imports of the investigated product as claimed by the Commission or their favorable applicants.

The Commission has only fulfilled the formalities for this sunset review as per the Act and the Rules, which is it bound to abide by and follow, however in reality the Commission violates the same just to unlawfully support the applicants, as the views and comments of the importers or their associations does not seem to quoted anywhere in the SEF document related to this review investigation nor the Commission ever gives any importance or

factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

Regarding the separate dumping margins for primary and secondary grades, it may be noted that the Commission imposed a single antidumping duty rate on the basis of lessor duty for both the grade despite calculating higher dumping margin for secondary grade. Moreover, the Commission is not modifying the dumping margins. The likely dumping margin would be analyzed in this review.

Further, the Applicants have submitted the evidence of normal value for Russian origin Cold Rolled steel i.e. Fast Market Global Limited subject to confidentially citing the reason that the same cannot be shared in public domain as per the terms of paid subscription.

#### Refer to para 22.2 of the Conclusion Report

The Commission examined the accuracy and adequacy of the information and evidence provided in application in accordance with Rule 32 & 36 of Rules and determined the likely dumping of product under review and likely injury to domestic industry in accordance with 40 & 41 of the Rules.

The Commission has considered all views/comments, data/information as well as explanations provided by the interested parties including KISMA, keeping in view relevant provisions of the Act, Rules, the Antidumping Agreement and judgement of

seriousness to what other interested parties has to say but only honorable Appellate Tribunal while and only what the applicants desire and asks the Commission, concluding this sunset review. the same is always fulfilled, as the association being part of almost all the investigations, reviews and circumvention cases have also observed the same, which leaves no hindrance but to point out that the Commission and its personnel are corrupt and informed in malpractices, where they have their own interests linked to that applicants...... The association has also filed a 6 page long document titled port hearing comments, which included 14 points including the illegalities of the applicants, their consultants and shortcomings of the Commission, which included most important point that no imports during the period of review have been made from the Russian Federation, however the same cannot be even seen in the SEF document, many other important points and issues raised during the hearing have all been disregarded by the Commission, in conclusion the Commission is not fair in its approach and then expects the imports and their association to have trust in the Commission and also asks the associations representatives to proceed with filling appeals to Anti-Dumping Tribunal for their concerns. During the course of original investigation, it was informed to the The findings and determination made Commission by our member and importer M/S Safa Steel, that during the original investigation are final the applicants are only producing, rather processing materials and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Antiunder the followina PCTs.....they also import the dumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a investigated material themselves without any hindrance, as anticlosed and past matter. dumping duties and all sorts all other duties i.e. custom duties. additional customs duties and regulatory duties are for the importers only, the applicants being waived off from all duties and with limited taxes, they wish for imposition of anti-dumping duties on each and every origin, one after the another, as well as continuation of the same upon its expiry for another 5 years and wish to be same to be applied forever. During the course of original investigation it was informed to the The Commission has clearly defined the Commission that the domestic like product and imported product product review in this sunset review and are not like products, the same is being repeated now as well, has excluded the grades which are not to which we have already proved in our response to the being manufactured by the domestic Commission against applicants application to the sunset review The Commission has industry. and change of circumstances determined that the product under review and the domestic like products are like review......Our member and importer M/S Safa Steel has already presented the products. catalogs/brochures and technical data of the exporters/foreign producers to the Commission during the course of original investigation, but the Commission never paid any heed or importance to it, therefore the same should be presented again and again, specially when the Commission blindly accepts the data only presented to it by the applicants as to the Commission

the best information available is only the one submitted by applicants, and it ignores whatever is being submitted by other interested parties.

The Commission has a serious flaw in its applicants questionnaire where it does not ask the applicants to disclose its sales with respect to customer names and NTN numbers, on the other hand the Commissions questionnaire to importers asks the same, which has no use to the Commission, if the Commission asks such details from the applicants it would be able to match with the PRAL data it has which it shares illegally with the applicants and never with the importers or their associations, as the Commission has done the same in ADC No. 51/2017/NTC/CCCS, the Commission will itself figure out that the applicants are in violation of Section 2(d) of the Act and thus do not fall under the scope of domestic industry, as it directly controls the importers by getting imposed unconstitutional antidumping duties i.e. does not allowing importers to import and directly controlling the exporters by not allowing them to export the same while importing their raw material Hot Rolled Steel from the very same exporters as well as Cold Rolled Steel from the very same exporters.

The findings and determination made during the original investigation are final and have not been challenged by any interested party on this ground in the Antidumping Appellate Tribunal. Hence it is a closed and past matter.

Furthermore, refer to Section 2(d) of the Act that defines the domestic industry also outlines the requirements of the relationship in the context of this law relevant exact of Section 2(d) is as follows:

- ".... For the purposes of this clause, producers shall be deemed to be related to exporters or importers only if;
- i. one of them directly or indirectly controls the other:
- ii. both of them are directly or indirectly controlled by the same third person; or
- iii. together they directly or indirectly control a third person;

......."

In view of the above, importing products which may include raw materials do not mean that there is a relationship between two entities. Besides, the domestic industry did not import the product under review during the POR. Neither do they have any relationship with the exporters as per Section 2(d) of the Act, which can be verified through the financials of the Applicants available in public domain being public limited companies.

 Refer to the on-the-spot verification reports of the applicants, in which the Commission has explicitly stated the specific grades and sizes of CR Coils/Sheets that are produced by the domestic industry and those that are not.

industry, as the auto grades have been excluded by the Commission but not all as many grades including the other auto grades are even not in the capacity of the applicants/domestic industry, therefore all of these must be removed from the scope of this investigation.

Rule 32 applies to the requirements of the application whereas Rule 40 and 41 applies to the determination of the Commission while concluding the sunset review investigation.

The Commission afforded the opportunity to provide such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and a comprehensive exporters questionnaire was sent. However, no response and tangible evidence was provided to the Commission. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provisions of the Act. Besides, this sunset review is not revising the margins of antidumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess likelihood of recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

The Commission complete failed to examine and verify accuracy and adequacy of the evidence and information provided in the application in accordance with Section 23 of the Act and its determination was incorrect that there was sufficient evidence of dumping of Cold Rolled Steel Coils/ Sheets into Pakistan from exporting countries and consequent material injury to the domestic industry, as the Commission relied on the data of the applicants only and ignored the same given the importers and other interested parties, the investigated product and domestic like product are NOT by any means "like products" as the Commission claims it to be and there was no dumping done by the exporting countries as the normal values relied upon by the Commission was very unsteady and unactual, nor there was any injury to the so called domestic industry caused by the exports/imports of the investigated product as claimed by the Commission or their favorable applicants.

The Commission examined the accuracy and adequacy of the information and evidence provided in application in accordance with Rule 32 & 36 of Rules and determined the likely dumping of product under review and likely injury to domestic industry in accordance with 40 & 41 of the Rules.

The Commission has violated Section 32 of the Act as it relied only and only upon the information submitted to it by the applicants which it mentions as the best information available and the best information available is only what is given by the applicants, none of the information is best which is provided by any other interested party, the foreign producers/exporters catalogs/brochures. The Commission has not verified this

The Commission examined the accuracy and adequacy of the information and evidence provided in application in accordance with Rule 32 & 36 of Rules.

information as per section 32(4) of the Act, as far as Russia is concerned, the figures shown in table-17 of the application seems fabricated and assumed, as www.trademap.com does not show any figures of the exports from Russia to any country after 2021, the applicants are trying to show that the quantities to major markets of Russian exports have decreased. The Commission is violating Section 35 of the Act and Rule 11 of the Rules as it states that during the course of this investigation the Commission has satisfied itself to the accuracy and adequacy of information and evidence supplied by the interested parties to the extent possible for the purposes of this preliminary determination.

The Commission in terms of Section 3.1 of the Act has kept all information confidential which was presented to it by all interested parties marked as confidential with a condition that non-confidential version of the same is provided to be kept in the file, however it's a false claim of the Commission that all non-confidential summaries of the confidential information submitted by the applicants provides reasonable understanding of the substance, that is not the case with the information submitted to the Commission by the applicants and on many instances simply no summaries can be found of the data submitted by the applicants a paper is found stating that confidentiality is claimed, therefore this fully highlights the wrongful and illegal support of the Commission towards the applicants.

Refer to Section 31 of the Act, the Commission shall keep confidential any information submitted to it, which is by nature confidential, or determined by the Commission to be of a confidential nature for any other reason or provided as confidential by the interested parties upon good cause shown to be kept confidential.

Without doubt the quantities from exporting countries have decreased during the POR than they were during the original POI, but the applicants are crumpling the main issue here, which is the market size contraction, where in first year of original POI, total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at 666,788.50 MT, the quantities in first year of POR stood at 166,332,757 MT, thus there were over 75% lesser imports in total, similarly in the second year of original POI total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at 362,398.697 MT, the quantities in second year of POR stood at 110,216.2428 MT, where about 70% lesser imports in total were seen and in the last year of original POI total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at 496,442.194 MT, the quantities in the last year of POR stood at 78,139.987 MT, which were over 84% less than the last year of original POI, therefore quantities from all origins decreased to much extent, not just from the exporting countries in the current case and antidumping duties could not be said an assistance to the same but the main reason was the market size. There stands no threat of more material coming in from the exporting countries as the market size is already contracted, mainly due to auto market performing at the lowest level of their output in decades, most of the importers have switched their product due to end user not buying Cold Rolled steel finding alternatives of the same or

Although the total market has shrunk, the share of domestic industry has increased during POR showing the positive impact on imposition of antidumping duties.

importers importing other steel products, moreover, Russian producers have made production cuts, their price reduction also did not helped to find new markets or increase quantities to existing markets, where from Canada only secondary material being imported into Pakistan and no prime quality, there lies no menace for the applicants to cry upon......and no prime quality, there lies no menace for the applicants to cry upon.

The applicants have based the normal value of Cold Rolled steel coils/sheets in Canada based on MEPS International of UK, however they are not representing only Canadian values but US/NAFTA values which are very high in comparison to Canadian prices itself, otherwise the most exports made by Canadian exporters of Cold Rolled steel would definitely not be USA as shown by the applicants in their application to the Commission themselves, moreover all imports during the original POI as well as during the POR were of secondary materials only from Canada, whose price cannot be determined through any publisher, as firstly no publisher in the world publishes original transaction prices of secondary steel nor estimated prices, secondly secondary steel prices have their own mechanism and depends mainly on the defect or the quality of the material, together with thickness/widths, specifications to reach a price, origin wise prices are also different, whereas secondary prices are mainly depended if the steel factories of any country allow the local sale of the same, most importantly it is the bargain power of both the seller and buyer which determines secondary steel prices.

For the purpose of the original investigation, the Commission has reduced/discounted its constructed prices of prime quality for both Russian Federation and Canada by 26.66% by from the import prices available to them to reach the secondary quality prices, however such a practice is not seen by the Commission during this review investigation, nor the applicants have made any such adjustment, and the Commission is accepting the normal values as they are being submitted by the applicants. without any verification or due diligence, this gives a serious doubt about Commission's ability to conduct such investigations, where it must also be mentioned that if the Commission discounts such a percentage, the same cannot be agreed upon as any fix percentage could not help reach normal value of secondary steel or any origin or in any country, which could vary but not limited to 20% to 60% of prime quality steel prices, other reasons are well explained in our response to the Commission against applicants application. Any adjustment of VAT, duty draw back or GST can also not be seen in Canadian prices.

The applicants have based the normal value of Cold Rolled steel coils/sheets in Russia based on Fastmarkets Global Limited of

This sunset review is not revising the margins of anti-dumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors have been used to assess the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

The Commission afforded the opportunity to provide such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and a comprehensive exporters questionnaires were sent. However, no response and tangible evidence was provided to the Commission. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provision of the Act.

Further, the Applicants have submitted the evidence of normal value for Russian origin Cold Rolled steel i.e. Fast Market Global Limited subject to confidentially citing the reason that the same cannot be shared in public domain as per the terms of paid subscription.

Regarding the separate dumping margins for primary and secondary grades, it may be noted that the Commission imposed a single antidumping duty rate on the basis of lessor duty for both the grade despite calculating higher dumping margin for secondary grade. Moreover, the Commission is not modifying the dumping margins. The likely dumping margin would be analyzed in this review.

Refer to para 22.2 of the Conclusion Report

UK, which are not actual values but representing and reference values only as the Fastmarkets states itself under point no. 3 titled scope of services on page no. 3, they clearly state that the values provided are for general information only, therefore no reliance can be made on the same, as it does not promise accuracy of the content or information published, terms of use of Fastmarkets are attached in attachment no. 1 to this document.

For the purpose of the original investigation, the Commission has reduced/discounted its constructed prices of prime quality for both Russian Federation and Canada by 26.66% by from the import prices available to them to reach the secondary quality prices, though most of the material imported from Russia during the POR is of secondary quality, however such a practice is not seen by the Commission during this review investigation, nor the applicants have made any such adjustment, and the Commission is accepting the normal values as they are being submitted by the applicants, without any verification or due diligence, this gives a serious doubt about Commission's ability to conduct such investigations, where it must also be mentioned that if the Commission discounts such a percentage, the same cannot be agreed upon as any fix percentage could not help reach normal value of secondary steel or any origin or in any country, which could vary but not limited to 20% to 60% of prime quality steel prices, other reasons are well explained in our response to the Commission against applicants application.

The applicants has taken freight rates from a US based company, not showing any date of the rate of freight but is general for the year 2023 where it last updated on October 13th 2023, which date is out of scope of review, however as it varies on daily basis, secondly, if the freight had to be taken by the applicants, the right approach would be to take from any forwarder in Canada or Russia or by any shipping agent in Pakistan but the applicants found it easier to take the same from a USA based which is not even a freight forwarder or shipping company but movers only, which is giving freight rates by 20' or 40' containers, though all of the product under review is shipped to Pakistan from Russia is by breakbulk and by 20' container for Canada, the Commission can see for itself in the imports data presented by us or the same available to it from PRAL, which it only shares with the applicants and not with the importers or their association, that all of the imports from Russia are done using breakbulk mode of shipment, where our presented imports data also shows the same as all of the entries ex Russia are of and KEWB (Karachi West Wharf Berth) for the product under review, it would have been much easier for the applicants to show its own imports data from Russia of Hot Rolled as they had

Further, the article shared by applicants and their consultants all related to plate mill expansions at Algoma Steel – Canada, https://manufacturing-today.com/news/algoma-steel/, the article further itself states that the same expansion was for plate mill not for Cold Rolled steel, as CEO Michael McQuade mentions "we're a significant producer of hot and cold rolled sheet, but we see steel plate as an important product for us going forward, particularly with the infrastructure spend we are seeing and the broader stimulus spending expected in Canada and the United States, when it comes to heavy construction and mining equipment, there are strict abrasion resistance requirements for steel that we can deliver on. We also see a really strong market in bridges and other government-sanctioned infrastructure. In short, we'll be participating in a very important segment of an animated growth market for the foreseeable future.

The article shared in annexure-I of the application for ArcelorMittal Canada steel plant relates to the expansion which is meant to be a transition away from BF-BOF furnace steelmaking to the greener DRI-EAF production; it should

The Applicants have resorted to journals/publications for establishing their stance on this point. Journals/publications usually contain consolidated results. Importers have confronted the point that planned installed capacity of the exporters is of steel products not covered under this sunset review.

Please refer to para 22.3 of the Conclusion report. The Commission has examined the expansion of furnace capacity, which is, to a certain extent, related to the product under review.

reduce emissions at the plant by 60%, as announced in July, 2021, the investment will reduce annual CO2 emissions at ArcelorMittal's Hamilton, Ontario operations by approximately 3 million tonnes, which represents approximately 60% of emissions. This means the Hamilton plant will transition away from the blast furnace-basic oxygen furnace steelmaking production route to the Direct Reduced Iron (DRI) – Electric Arc Furnace (EAF) production route, which carries a significantly lower carbon footprint

The article presented by the applicants in annexure-J of the application, mentions that the fund of C\$ 2 billion was to assist Canadian steel industry mainly to avoid bankruptcies, where Stelco, Inc., a major steel producer in Canada, has gone into bankruptcy twice in this century, both bankruptcies involved significant Canadian government support, including nearly C\$200 million (U.S \$156.4) in low-interest loans and cancellation or reduction of tax and pension liabilities.

The main reason for which the Canadian government established this fund of C\$ 2 billion to assist Canadian steel industry was announced by the Canadian government that in a direct, measured and proportional response to the U.S. tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum, reciprocal surtaxes will be imposed on imports of steel, aluminum and other products from the United States and will come into effect on July 1, 2018, this fund was allocated to defend and protect the interests of Canadian workers and businesses in the steel, aluminum and manufacturing industries.

As per annexure-L of the application, the article The Russian Steel Industry Expects Capacity Underutilization According To The Results Of 2022, itself states the industry is already considering the options of stopping part of the main units, switching to a part-time working week and significantly reducing employees. Also, steelmakers say that the current crisis can negatively affect the socio-economic situation in the regions of presence.

As shown by the applicants on table-17 of the applicants application and verified on www.trademap.com, the quantities of exports from Canada has increased to the world by about 41% from 2012 to 2022, where their major market was USA in 2018 having exported about 95% of the material of Cold Rolled to USA, in 2022 over 98% of the material was exported to USA, where developed new markets as Cuba, losing Pakistan's market is not much of a problem for Canada, where the market size is even shrinking, Canadian producers/exporters on other markets if Pakistan is not able to buy from

The Commission does not solely rely on the information provided in the application. Instead, it conducts a thorough examination and analysis before reaching any conclusions in a review investigation. Additionally, the Commission examined the accuracy and adequacy of the information and evidence provided in application in accordance with Rule 32 & 36 of Rules.

However, the Commission in table-IX of the SEF document has mentioned that EU, UK and Mexico have imposed anti-dumping duties on Russian Federation but since there has been no imports of Cold Rolled materials from Russia to Pakistan or hardly any, the Commission cannot re-impose anti-dumping duties for another 5 years, it has been well explained to the Commission during the hearing held at the Commissions office/conference room on 10th September 2024, that all the materials after illegal imposition of anti-dumping duties on Cold Rolled steel of Russian origin has been coming from Kazakhstan and not from Russia, the proofs of the same was also provided to the Commission in our post hearing comments submitted to the Commission on 19th September 2024, but as always no use. where GD's (goods declaration) MTC's (mills test certificates) and COO (certificate of origin) of the material of Kazakhstan origin were shared with the Commission.

FBR's import data is used in the Commission's review / investigation represents the origin of imports after applying the requirements of certification or origin. Therefore, port of shipments, if different do not have any implication on the reporting of the origin.

According to the World Steel Association, Russia's steel production fell by 6.6% to 60.4 million tons in January- October 2022. By the end of 2022, production of flat steel products is expected to have fallen by 23%, long products by 15%, and semi-finished products by 6%, further on the very same page, it states for 2023, the Russian steel industry still confronts various obstacles including international sanctions, high interest rates, postponement of downstream projects, etc. The Russian government is devising policies to alleviate the negative situation, hoping to gradually restore demand through the construction of large facilities, with the ultimate goal of halting the decline in steel demand. The Russian Ministry of Construction has planned to consume steel in the construction of educational institutions and residential areas.....they could have easilv reduced prices to that extent in order to sell their product or the product under review to Pakistan but that did not happened.

The article also mentions that in 2022 steel production in Russia is decreasing on monthly basis, where rating agency Finch

In compliance with Rule 40 of the Rules, this section examines the overall market conditions of exporting countries, including fluctuations in the supply and demand of the product under review, to determine the likely dumping of the product under review.

Please refer to para 22.6 of the Conclusion report

annulled the ratings of 22 Russian commodity companies including that in the mining and metals sector, and the applicants have to claim that Russia would dump its steel products into Pakistan if illicit anti-dumping duties imposed on Russia against import of Cold Rolled Steel Coils/Sheets are discontinued in Pakistan. Pakistan is not a new market for Russian steel products, where both the applicants have themselves been importing their raw material, Hot Rolled Steel and other steel related items i.e. steel straps from Russia, within the period of review, other steel importers and industrial users also import Hot Rolled Steel from Russia......The article with title "GUSTAFSON: The rise and fall of Russian steel", itself states that the western sanctions on Russia have all but closed its access to the European and US markets and technologies, forcing it to retrench back to the domestic Russian market and limiting its ability to innovate, therefore there is no chance of Russian steel being exported to Pakistani market in large numbers, specially when the Russian steel materials are more emphasized on their domestic market, where Pakistan being more involved in trade with China, mainly due to China-Pakistan FTA (free trade agreement), there is highly no chance of increase of imports of the reviewed product from Russia to Pakistan.

It could be clearly read here that the Russian government has asked prices below market for some period only and for home only to avoid sanctions-induced economic downturn, not for exports, the domestic steel prices have fallen by atleast 15% in Russia, if that was meant for exports, Russian exporters would easily have exported to Pakistan in huge quantities, since the illegal anti-dumping duties have been imposed from September 2019, where the anti-dumping duties rate is 13.94%, but since the domestic prices have fallen in Russia by atleast 15% it would be easier for them to export to Pakistan by all means but that did not happened as we have seen a decline in imports from Russia by over 78% in the last year of POR from them of second year of POR, thus this confirms that the reduction in steel prices were only for Russian domestic market...... According to MEPS International article dated 4th March 2024, it would be worth the same to be quoted by the Commission if Canada has imported or Pakistani importers have imported large quantities of Cold Rolled steel from Canada during the period of original investigation or during the period of review i.e. after the illegal and unlawful antidumping duties imposed on Canadian Cold Rolled steel, but the fact is that quantities are very small in all the period, most important only secondary quality steel is imported from Canada which is already very much high in cost having higher tariffs which is 20% customs duty, 10% regulatory

duty, 6% additional customs duty, sales tax, additional sales tax and income tax to be added on top or extra, therefore quoting such articles of Canadian market or demand patterns is very insensible from the Commission. Without doubt the quantities from exporting countries have Although the total domestic market of CR decreased during the POR than they were during the original Coils/Sheets has significantly decreased. POI, but the applicants are crumpling the main issue here, which However, the share of domestic industry is the market size contraction, where in first year of original POI, has increased during POR showing the total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel positive impact of imposition of antidumping stood at 666,788.50 MT, the quantities in first year of POR stood duties. at 166,332.757 MT, thus there were over 75% lesser imports in total, similarly in the second year of original POI total quantities Please refer to para 23.6 of the Conclusion imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at report 362,398.697 MT, the quantities in second year of POR stood at 110,216.2428 MT, where about 70% lesser imports in total were seen and in the last year of original POI total quantities imported from all origins for Cold Rolled steel stood at 496,442.194 MT, the quantities in the last year of POR stood at 78,139.987 MT, which were over 84% less than the last year of original POI, therefore quantities from all origins decreased to much extent, not just from the exporting countries in the current case and antidumping duties could not be said an assistance to the same but the main reason was the market size...... As per the figures shown table-XII of the initiation memo and in table-1 of the application of sunset review, it is evident that the only thing which was increasing during the POR was market share of the domestic industry which kept on increasing from the last year of POI to first, second and third year of POR, other producers sales/share was decreasing, which alleged dumped imports from sources other than Canada and Russia, along with them as well imports from other sources were also decreasing. In such an economic scenario which Pakistan faces, it is imperative and a must do thing for the Commission to firstly close such units of production like that of applicants who not just give serious negative impact on foreign currency reserves -dodisturbing the country's balance of payments, but also give nothing in return to the country, as they rip off the nation with customs duties, regulatory duties, and additional customs duties but also do a gimmick in sales tax and additional sales tax, their income and profitability solely relies on the exemptions and tax benefits they have to achieve from any government, which is their ultimate aim and purpose of business, the same has well been explained in our response to the Commission against the applicants application proving with the help of figures of imports, exports and contributions towards the national exchequer mentioned to be read on page nos. 13 to 16 of our response to the applicants application. The applicants did not faced any price suppression in the The Commission has considered the price second year of POR, October 2021 to September 2022, where effects in accordance with the provisions of

their import prices of raw material HRC were as high as USD 1096 per MT in the first quarter of the second year of POR, their import prices of raw material HRC prices reduced to USD 640 per MT in the last guarter of the second year of POR, which is a reduction of over 41.50%, where USD appreciated against PKR by 34.50% about, however in the second last year of the POR they were able to increase their prices by over 14%, thus giving them the advantage of over 21% in increasing their prices then their cost, therefore no price suppression can be claimed by Therefore. the Commission's them..... statements cannot be justified by stating that the domestic industry will not be able to recover any increase in cost to make and sell of the domestic like product if anti-dumping duties are terminated, as the increasing cost of the domestic industry by increasing raw material prices in international market, PKR devaluation against USD and increasing international market would have lead to increase in prices of the applicants whether or not anti-dumping duties were imposed.

the Act and Rule 41 of the Rules, while concluding this review investigation.

Please refer to para 23.3 of the Conclusion report

The net profit of the applicants during the POI kept increasing by 340% in the second year of POI and by 39% in the last year of POI, which decreased in the second year of POR by 52.59% and further decreasing by over 95% in the last year of POR. The above clearly shows that the profitability of the applicants was much higher during the POI with the absence of anti-dumping duties and certainly there was no need of the same to be irrationally imposed concluded wrong by the Commission since there is a likelihood of price depression to be faced by the domestic industry if antidumping duties are removed, which have well be proven in the above paragraphs also in our response to the Commission against applicants application, further to this there is no likelihood of the decline in profits or profitability or having any adverse effects on the same in case anti-dumping duties are removed, as they were making much more profits during the POI than the applicants made during the POR.

In the context of sunset review that the Commission carries out in depth analysis of the injury factors including the profitability which is product specific and are reported in the Commission's on-the-spot verification/investigation reports and are made part of the Commission's report on conclusion of sunset review.

Please refer to para 23.8 of this report for analysis and conclusion on the net profits/(loss) of the domestic industry.

If the cash flows were to be increased after imposition of antidumping duties they would have had a positive affect immediately after imposition of anti-dumping duties and during the whole of POR not just last year, where the applicants had positive cash flows throughout the POI apart from the reasons given in the above paragraph, it can fairly be concluded that the applicants were better off in terms of cash flows during the POI without the imposition of anti-dumping duties.

Please refer to para 23.12 of this report for analysis and conclusion on the cashflows.

With decreasing ROI during the POR, the applicants were much better of during the POI as without the imposition of any antidumping duties on Canada and Russia, they were able to make significant investments and increase their capacities, with no chance of increase in volume of imports from the exporting In compliance of Section 58 of the Act and Rule 41 of the Rules, the impact of antidumping duties imposed on injury factors are analyzed to assess the likelihood of recurrence of injury if anti-dumping duties in countries, the domestic industry's and applicants production, sales price and return of investment have no threats, therefore the applicants would not be harmed in anyway whatsoever in case of discontinuation of antidumping duties on Canada and Russia.

International Steels Limited's production was at 370811 MT in the year 2016 while it employed 551 number of people. productivity per worker was about 650 MT, in 2017 it produced 464023 MT while it employed 563 number of people, productivity per worker was about 824 MT and in 2018 it produced 470841 MT while it employed 633 number of people, productivity per worker was about 744 MT. Aisha Steel Mills Limited's production was at 195906 MT in the year 2016 while it employed 389 number of people, productivity per worker was about 504 MT, in 2017 it produced 209524 MT while it employed 406 number of people, productivity per worker was about 516 MT and in 2018 it produced 217370 MT while it employed 486 number of people, productivity per worker was about 447 MT. Therefore, it can be evidently stated that the applicants were better off in terms of employment, salaries, wages and productivity per MT during the POI, rather they in the POR.

place are terminated. Therefore, it is not required by law that injury factors such as growth and investments must be negatively affected in order to continue the anti-dumping measures already in place.

Refer to para 23.12 of the report for analysis on employment, salaries & wages and productivity.

If by any chance, the Commission continues the imposition of anti-dumping duties on Cold Rolled steel from Russia and Canada, it would be causing more and huge losses not just to the importers but also the economy of Pakistan as a whole, explanations already given above, where the Commission must limit the widths of the Cold Rolled steel, as in A.D.C No. 35/2015/NTC/CRC/SSR/2020, conclusion of sunset review of anti-dumping duties imposed on dumped imports of Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets imported from People's Republic of China and and in A.D.C No. 60/2021/NTC/CRC, determination on dumped imports of Cold Rolled Coils/Sheets into Pakistan originating in and/or exported from Chinese Taipei, European Union, Republic of Korea and Socialist Republic of Vietnam, the Commission has mentioned a maximum of 1250 mm width which is produced by the domestic industry/applicants ..... which is not produced and supplied by the domestic industry or the applicants.

The Commission has clearly defined investigated product while concluding this review and has defined the grades which are excluded from scope of this review. Further, the Commission has determined that the domestic industry produced TMBP during POR.

Please refer to para 13 of the report regarding the product under review.

The Commission does not consider it appropriate to set the upper limit of width due to the possibility of circumvention.

## Views/Comments of Ministry of Economic Development of the Russian Federation and the Ministry of Industry and Trade of the Russian Federation (SEF)

In accordance with Article 11.1 of the Agreement on Implementation of Article VI GATT 1994 (hereinafter – the Anti-Dumping Agreement), «An anti-dumping duty shall remain in force only as long as and to the extent necessary to counteract dumping which is causing injury».

Moreover, in accordance with Article 6.9 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement, «The authorities shall, before a final determination is made, inform all interested parties of the essential facts under consideration which form the basis for the decision whether to

The Commission afforded the opportunity to provide such information/evidence to all the interested parties and importers and a comprehensive exporters questionnaire was sent. However, no response and tangible evidence was provided to the Commission. The Commission has relied on the best information available as per the provisions of the Act. Besides, this sunset

apply definitive measures. Such disclosure should take place in sufficient time for the parties to defend their interests».

The Statement of Essential Facts does not contain calculation of normal value, export price and dumping margin. Paragraphs 17.3.5 and 17.3.5 contain only methodology of calculations and sources of information of normal value and export price. It should be noted that the disclosure requirement of Article 6.9 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement is of utmost importance................... The Russian side finds itself deprived of the opportunities to verify the correctness and reliability of the calculations of the essential facts and to present its case for the defense of its interests in accordance with Article 6.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement.

review is not revising the margins of antidumping duties. This indicative factor along with various other factors listed in Rule 40 & 41 of the Rules have been used to determine the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case antidumping duties imposed are terminated.

In accordance with Article 11.2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement "Interested parties shall have the right to request the authorities to examine whether the continued imposition of the duty is necessary to offset dumping, whether the injury would be likely to continue or recur if the duty were removed or varied, or both. If, as a result of the review under this paragraph, the authorities determine that the anti-dumping duty is no longer warranted, it shall be terminated immediately".

In the opinion of the Russian side, there is no evidence of likelihood of recurrence or continuation of material injury to the domestic industry of Pakistan that could be caused by import of cold-rolled sheet from Russia to Pakistan. The Statement of Essential Facts reveals favorable position of the domestic industry of Pakistan. In particular, the following financial and economic factors of the development of the industry as well as market indicators demonstrate growth during the period of the review (in October 2022-September 2023 in comparison with January – December 2018):

- increase of installed capacity by 52 percent;
- increase of ex-factory price of domestic like product's by 165 percent;
- increase of Applicants' profit (M/s Aisha Steel Mills Limited, Karachi and M/s International Steel Limited, Karachi) by 4 percent

In the opinion of the Russian side, the Statement of Essential Facts does not include evidence of causal link between possible injury to domestic industry of Pakistan and import from Russia for the following reasons:

The Commission has determined the likelihood of the recurrence of dumping and injury in case anti-dumping duties imposed on product under review are terminated.

Please refer to para 23 of the conclusion report

In the sunset review investigation, the Commission shall determine the likely dumping of the product under review and likely injury to domestic industry in accordance with Section 58 of Act and 40 & 41 of the Rules.

The Applicants have resorted to journals/publications for establishing their stance on this point. Journals/publications

domestic market as specified in the article. Exporters set prices for their products independently on market conditions.

usually contain consolidated results. Importers have confronted the point that planned installed capacity of the exporters is of steel products not covered under this sunset review.

Please refer to para 22.3 of the report. The Commission has examined the expansion of furnace capacity, which is, to a certain extent, related to the product under review.

In compliance of Section 58 of the Act and Rule 41 of the Rules, the impact of antidumping duties imposed on injury factors are analyzed to assess the likelihood of recurrence of injury to the domestic industry if anti-dumping duties are expired.

Please refer to para 23 of the report.

The Russian side draws attention of the Authority to the fact that. in accordance with the provisions of Article 3.5 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement, injury caused by other factors must not be attributed to the dumped imports. The paragraph 18 of the Statement of Essential Facts provides data on the production and financial activities of the industry of Pakistan in 2018-2023. In accordance with the paragraph, producers of Pakistan have significantly reduced the volume of production from 63,65 per cent of installed capacity in January-December 2018 to 23,03 per cent in October 2022 - September 2023. The industry reveals significant reduction of the level of domestic sales from 57,02 per cent of installed capacity in January-December 2018 to 25,45 per cent in October 2022 - September 2023..... The Russian side asks the Authority to pay attention to other factors that could influence the industry of Pakistan, in particular, elevated energy costs, significant dependence on imported raw materials and low demand from consumer industries, indicated in point 18.9 of the Statement of Essential Facts.

Taking into account the above, the Russian side believes that there are no grounds for extending the anti-dumping measure and hopes that this review will be terminated without extending the measure.