



## Anti-Dumping Review Panel - Conference Summary

### 2017/55 – A4 Copy Paper Exported from the Federative Republic of Brazil, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of Thailand

*Greenpoint Global Trading (Macao Commercial Offshore) Limited (Greenpoint)*

Applicant	Greenpoint Global Trading (Macao Commercial Offshore) Limited (Greenpoint)
Panel Member	Jaclyne Fisher
Date	7 August 2017
Participants	Justin Wickes (Anti-Dumping Commission), Tim King (Anti-Dumping Commission)
Time opened	4.00 pm
Time closed	5.00 pm

#### *Purpose*

The purpose of this conference is to obtain further information in relation to the review before the ADRP, in relation to A4 Copy Paper exported from the Federative Republic of Brazil, the People’s Republic of China, the Republic of Indonesia and the Kingdom of Thailand.

In the course of this conference, I may ask parties to clarify an argument, claim or specific detail contained in the party’s application or submission. The conference is not a formal hearing of the review, and is not an opportunity for parties to argue their case before me.

I may only have regard to information provided at this conference that relates to relevant information (within the meaning of section 269ZZK(6) of the *Customs Act 1901*). Any conclusions reached at this conference are based on that relevant information.

#### *Discussion*

1. The Panel Member asked the Commission whether, as claimed by the applicant, the discounts and rebates have been added to the net domestic selling price as this has not been listed as an adjustment in the Table in section 6.8.3.4 of REP 341. If this is the case, could the Commission explain the rationale for this adjustment, noting that the applicant claims these discounts would have been available on the export sales if these had been made in the domestic market?

The Commission provided a copy of the confidential spreadsheet and outlined its calculation of the normal value, which revealed that the relevant models had been used and the rebates/discounts had been deducted from the gross price and then had been subject to an upward s.269TAC(8) adjustment. The Commission indicated that it was not satisfied that the exporter would have been granted these quantity (and other) discounts given the quantity discount threshold in the domestic market.

The Commission also stated that it appeared that the applicant had provided clarification of its comments submitted post SEF in its application to the Review Panel in relation to other domestic customers and discount and rebate arrangements.