



RB2 2022 ER

BY E-MAIL: canada@moea.gov.tw ; shlo@moea.gov.tw

Henry Chih-Hung Liu
Executive Director of Economic Division
Taipei Economic & Cultural Office in Ottawa
World Exchange Plaza
45 O'Connor Street, Suite 1960
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 1A4

August 26, 2022

Dear Henry Chih-Hung Liu:

On March 29, 2022, the Canadian International Trade Tribunal (CITT), pursuant to subsection 76.03(3) of the *Special Import Measures Act* (SIMA), initiated an expiry review of its finding made on May 3, 2017, in Inquiry No. NQ-2016-003, concerning the dumping of certain concrete reinforcing bar originating in or exported from Belarus, the Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu (Chinese Taipei), the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (Hong Kong), Japan, Portugal and Spain.

As a result of the CITT's expiry review, the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) initiated, on March 30, 2022, an expiry review investigation to determine, pursuant to paragraph 76.03(7)(a) of SIMA, whether the expiry of the CITT's finding is likely to result in the continuation or resumption of dumping of the subject goods.

The expiry review investigation has now been completed and today, pursuant to paragraph 76.03(7)(a) of SIMA, the CBSA has determined that the expiry of the CITT's finding is likely to result in the continuation or resumption of dumping of such goods originating in or exported from Belarus, Chinese Taipei, Hong Kong, Japan, Portugal and Spain.

A Statement of Reasons that contains additional details concerning the determination made by the CBSA will be issued within 15 days and be available on the CBSA's website at:
www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/sima-lmsi/er-rre/menu-eng.html.

Any person directly affected by this determination may make an application to the Federal Court of Appeal, pursuant to section 96.1 of SIMA, to review the CBSA's determination. The term "persons directly affected" includes Canadian producers, exporters, and importers of the subject goods. The grounds for requesting a judicial review are outlined in the attached **Appendix**.

.../2

The CITT will now conduct an expiry review to determine whether the expiry of its finding is likely to result in injury to the domestic industry. The CITT has announced that it will issue its order by February 2, 2023. Anti-dumping duties will continue to be applicable on the subject goods until that date.

The CITT will conduct its expiry review in the manner set forth in the *Notice of Expiry Review of Finding* concerning certain concrete reinforcing bar as previously provided to interested persons. A copy of this notice and the schedule of the CITT's expiry review are also available on the CITT's website at: www.citt-tcce.gc.ca.

If the CITT determines that the expiry of the finding is not likely to cause injury, the finding will be rescinded. If the CITT determines that the expiry of the finding is likely to cause injury, it will issue an order to continue its finding, with or without amendment.

Questions concerning the CITT's future actions should be directed to the CITT, at the following address:

The Registrar
Canadian International Trade Tribunal
Standard Life Centre
333 Laurier Avenue West, 15th Floor
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0G7

Telephone: 613-949-2309
Email: citt-tcce@tribunal.gc.ca

Should you have any questions pertaining to this expiry review investigation, please contact Rand McNally, Manager, Anti-dumping and Countervailing Investigations Division, at 613-862-0443, or by e-mail at Rand.McNally@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca.

Yours truly,



Darryl Larson
Director
Anti-dumping and Countervailing Investigations Division
Trade and Anti-dumping Programs Directorate

Attachment

APPENDIX

GROUND FOR REQUESTING A JUDICIAL REVIEW UNDER THE *SPECIAL IMPORT MEASURES ACT*

The grounds for requesting a review by the Federal Court of Appeal of a determination made pursuant to paragraph 76.03(7)(a) of the *Special Import Measures Act* are that the President of the Canada Border Services Agency (President), in making the determination:

- (a) acted without jurisdiction, acted beyond the jurisdiction of the President or refused to exercise that jurisdiction;
- (b) failed to observe a principle of natural justice, procedural fairness or other procedure that the President was required by law to observe;
- (c) erred in law in making a decision, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record;
- (d) based a decision on an erroneous order of fact that the President made in a perverse or capricious manner or without regard for the material before the President;
- (e) acted or failed to act, by reason of fraud or perjured evidence; or
- (f) acted in any other way that was contrary to law.