

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/306 of 3 March 2016 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1283/2014 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings, of iron or steel, originating in the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an interim review pursuant to Article 11(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009

COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2016/306

of 3 March 2016

amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1283/2014 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings, of iron or steel, originating in the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an interim review pursuant to Article 11(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community<sup>(1)</sup> ('the basic Regulation'), and in particular Article 11(3) thereof,

Whereas:

1. **PROCEDURE**

1.1. **Previous investigations and existing anti-dumping measures**

(1) The anti-dumping measures in force on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating, inter alia, in the Republic of Korea were imposed by Council Regulation (EC) No 1514/2002<sup>(2)</sup> ('the original investigation' and 'the original measures').

(2) In October 2008, these measures were extended by Council Regulation (EC) No 1001/2008<sup>(3)</sup> following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation.

(3) In December 2014, the measures were further extended by Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1283/2014<sup>(4)</sup> following a second expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation ('the measures in force').

(4) The anti-dumping duty currently applicable to exports from all companies in the Republic of Korea is 44 %, based on the injury margin determined in the original investigation.

1.2. **Request for a partial interim review**

(5) In January 2015, the Commission received a request for a partial interim review pursuant to Article 11(3) of the basic Regulation. The request is limited in scope to the examination of dumping as far as TK Corporation, a Korean exporting producer,

---

*Changes to legislation: There are currently no known outstanding effects for the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/306. (See end of Document for details)*

---

is concerned and it was lodged by that exporting producer. In its request, the exporting producer claimed that the circumstances on the basis of which measures were imposed have changed and that these changes are of a lasting nature. The exporting producer provided prima facie evidence that the continued imposition of the measure at its current level was no longer necessary to offset injurious dumping.

### 1.3. **Initiation of a partial interim review**

(6) Having determined, after informing the Member States, that sufficient evidence existed to justify the initiation of a partial interim review limited to the examination of dumping as far as the exporting producer is concerned, the Commission announced by a notice published on 18 February 2015 in the *Official Journal of the European Union*<sup>(5)</sup> ('the Notice of Initiation') the initiation of a partial interim review in accordance with Article 11(3) of the basic Regulation, limited in scope to the examination of dumping in respect of the exporting producer.

(7) The Commission officially informed the exporting producer, the authorities of the exporting country and the Union industry of the initiation of the partial interim review investigation. Interested parties were given the opportunity to make their views known in writing and to be heard.

### 1.4. **Investigation**

(8) In order to obtain the information necessary for its investigation, the Commission sent a questionnaire to the exporting producer and received a reply within the deadline set for that purpose.

(9) The Commission sought and verified all information it deemed necessary for the determination of dumping. A verification visit was carried out at the premises of the exporting producer.

### 1.5. **Review investigation period**

(10) The investigation of the level of dumping covered the period from 1 January 2014 to 31 December 2014 ('the review investigation period').

(11) In addition to those data, the exporting producer also provided cost and sales data for 2013 and proposed extending the review investigation period by adding the year 2013 to increase the representativeness of its sales volumes to the Union. However, the Commission established that adding 2013 Union sales would not increase the representativeness in terms of volume (as compared to overall sales or production volume) or types of sales (see recital 29 below). Therefore, the Commission had no sufficient reason to deviate from the usual 12-month period to serve as a review investigation period for a representative finding with regard to dumping.

(12) Following final disclosure, the exporting producer reiterated its claim that 2013 should be added to the review investigation period to increase its representativeness. It argued that comparisons with factors such as total production volume were not relevant and that by adding 2013 to the review investigation period

it became more representative in terms of additional product types, sales volume and turnover.

(13) The basic Regulation does not specifically state how the representativeness of the review investigation period should be measured. In this case, the volumes allegedly sold by the exporting producer on the Union market during 2013 were less than half of the volumes allegedly sold on the Union market during the review investigation period, whereas its total sales and production volumes were in the same range for both years. It is thus clear in this case that in relative terms the addition of 2013 would decrease the representativeness of the exporting producer's Union sales whereas in absolute terms it would only provide limited improvement.

(14) Therefore, the Commission confirms that there is no valid justification for extending the review investigation period beyond the one-year period usually applied by the Commission.

## 2. PRODUCT CONCERNED AND LIKE PRODUCT

### 2.1. Product concerned

(15) The product under review is tube and pipe fittings (other than cast fittings, flanges and threaded fittings), of iron or steel (not including stainless steel), with a greatest external diameter not exceeding 609,6 mm, of a kind used for butt-welding or other purposes, originating in the Republic of Korea, currently falling within CN codes ex 7307 93 11, ex 7307 93 19 and ex 7307 99 80 ('the product concerned').

### 2.2. Like product

(16) The review investigation confirmed that the product produced by the exporting producer, sold domestically and exported to the Union and other export markets, has the same basic physical, technical and chemical characteristics and basic uses as the products sold in the Union by the Union industry.

(17) The Commission decided that those products are therefore like products within the meaning of Article 1(4) of the basic Regulation.

## 3. DUMPING

### (a) Normal value

(18) The Commission first examined whether the total volume of domestic sales for the exporting producer was representative, in accordance with Article 2(2) of the basic Regulation. The domestic sales are representative if the total domestic sales volume of the like product to independent customers on the domestic market per exporting producer represented at least 5 % of its total export sales volume of the product concerned to the Union during the investigation period. On this basis, the total sales by the exporting producer of the like product on the domestic market were representative.

(19) The Commission subsequently identified the product types sold domestically that were identical or comparable with the product types sold for export to the Union.

---

*Changes to legislation: There are currently no known outstanding effects for the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/306. (See end of Document for details)*

---

- (20) The Commission then examined whether the domestic sales by the exporting producer on its domestic market for each product type that is identical or comparable with a product type sold for export to the Union were representative, in accordance with Article 2(2) of the basic Regulation. The domestic sales of a product type are representative if the total volume of domestic sales of that product type to independent customers during the investigation period represents at least 5 % of the total volume of export sales of the identical or comparable product type to the Union. The Commission established that most product types were representative.
- (21) The Commission next defined the proportion of profitable sales to independent customers on the domestic market for each product type during the investigation period in order to decide whether to use actual domestic sales for the calculation of the normal value, in accordance with Article 2(4) of the basic Regulation.
- (22) The normal value is based on the actual domestic price per product type, irrespective of whether those sales are profitable or not, if:
- (a) the sales volume of the product type, sold at a net sales price equal to or above the calculated cost of production, represented more than 80 % of the total sales volume of this product type; and
  - (b) the weighted average sales price of that product type is equal to or higher than the unit cost of production.
- (23) In this case, the normal value is the weighted average of the prices of all domestic sales of that product type during the review investigation period.
- (24) The normal value is the actual domestic price per product type of only the profitable domestic sales of the product types during the review investigation period, if:
- (a) the volume of profitable sales of the product type represents 80 % or less of the total sales volume of this type; or
  - (b) the weighted average price of this product type is below the unit cost of production.
- (25) The analysis of domestic sales showed that a large majority of all domestic sales were profitable and that the weighted average sales price was higher than the cost of production. Accordingly, the normal value was calculated as a weighted average of the profitable sales only.
- (26) Where there were no or insufficient sales of a product type of the like product in the ordinary course of trade, or where a product type was not sold in representative quantities on the domestic market, the Commission constructed the normal value in accordance with Article 2(3) and (6) of the basic Regulation.
- (27) Normal value was constructed by adding the following to the average cost of production of the like product of the exporting producer during the review investigation period:

- (a) the weighted average selling, general and administrative ('SG&A') expenses incurred by the exporting producer on domestic sales of the like product, in the ordinary course of trade, during the review investigation period; and
  - (b) the weighted average profit realised by the exporting producer on domestic sales of the like product, in the ordinary course of trade, during the review investigation period.
- (28) For the product types not sold in representative quantities on the domestic market, the average SG&A expenses and profit of transactions made in the ordinary course of trade on the domestic market for those types were added. For the product types not sold at all on the domestic market, the weighted average SG&A expenses and profit of all transactions made in the ordinary course of trade on the domestic market were added.
- (b) *Export price*
- (29) In the review investigation period only negligible volumes of the product concerned were sold by the exporting producer to the Union, representing between 0,1 % and 0,3 % of its production volume (range given for reasons of confidentiality). In addition, for a number of transactions the exporting producer could not convincingly demonstrate that the anti-dumping duty had been effectively paid, which casts doubt on whether the goods had been released for free circulation in the Union customs territory. Moreover, those sales were all made to three customers for specific projects with their own specifications for fittings. In addition, the sales were made as a 'package' with other fittings and products that were not product concerned. In this context, the risk of cross-compensation was deemed substantial. For the above reasons, no meaningful analysis of dumping based on Union sales of the product concerned from the exporting producer during the review investigation period could be made.
- (30) In the absence of sufficient export volumes to the Union, exports to other third countries were considered for the determination of the export price. It was found that the exporting producer has four major export markets, which together cover over 50 % of the exporting producer's export sales to third countries during the review investigation period. The remainder consists of 39 other export destinations, each accounting for between 0,1 % to 5 % of the exporting producer's export sales. The export prices to these countries vary enormously reflecting the disparate nature of each market. Many of these disparate factors (such as the conditions of competition on each market) are not known. Therefore, it was further analysed whether one of the exporting producer's major export destinations could be used as a proxy for the Union market.
- (31) The United Arab Emirates ('UAE') is the largest export market for the exporting producer and accounted for 15 %-18 % of the exporting producer's export sales in weight and 15 %-18 % in value during the review investigation period. However, the UAE does not have domestic producers of the product concerned. It is therefore deemed to be rather different in terms of economic structure compared to the Union market.