

## Chapter 1 : Calculation of dumping margins (1/3) - racedaydvl.com

*On this page you will find the generic antidumping (AD) margin calculation programs. These programs are the starting point of our AD calculations. For a particular company in a proceeding, a case analyst will modify the boilerplate code as required for their case.*

**Determination of normal value**  
**General rule** The normal value is generally the price of the product at issue, in the ordinary course of trade, when destined for consumption in the exporting country market. In certain circumstances, for example when there are no sales in the domestic market, it may not be possible to determine normal value on this basis. The Agreement provides alternative methods for the determination of normal value in such cases. One of the bases on which countries may determine that sales are not made in the ordinary course of trade is if sales in the domestic market of the exporter are made below cost. Those sales must be made at prices that are below per unit fixed and variable costs plus administrative, selling and general costs, they must be made within an extended period of time normally one year, but in no case less than six months, and they must be made in substantial quantities. Finally, sales made below costs may only be disregarded in the determination of normal value where they do not allow for recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time. If sales are below cost when made but are above the weighted average cost over the period of the investigation, the Agreement provides that they allow for recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time.

**Insufficient volume of sales** If there are sales below cost that meet the criteria set out in the Agreement, they can simply be ignored in the calculation of normal value, and normal value will be determined based on the remaining sales. However, exclusion of these below-cost sales may result in a level of sales insufficient to determine normal value based on home market prices. It is obvious that, in the case where there are no sales in the exporting country of the product under investigation, it is not possible to base normal value on such sales, and the Agreement recognizes this. Thus, the Agreement recognizes that in some cases sales in the home market may be so low in volume that they do not permit a proper comparison of home market and export prices.

**Alternative bases for calculating normal value** Two alternatives are provided for the determination of normal value if sales in the exporting country market are not an appropriate basis. The Agreement contains detailed and specific rules for the determination of a constructed value, governing the information to be used in determining the amounts for costs, expenses, and profits, the allocation of these elements of constructed value to the specific product in question, and adjustments for particular situations such as start-up costs and non-recurring cost items.

**Third country price as normal value** The other alternative method for determining normal value is to look at the comparable price of the like product when exported to an appropriate third country, provided that price is representative. The Agreement does not specify any criteria for determining what third country is appropriate.

**Indirect exports** In the situation where products are not imported directly from the country of manufacture, but are exported from an intermediate country, the Agreement provides that the normal value shall be determined on the basis of sales in the market of the exporting country. However, the Agreement recognizes that this may result in an inappropriate or impossible comparison, for instance if the product is not produced in the exporting country, there is no comparable price for the product in the exporting country, or the product is merely transshipped through the exporting country. In such cases, the normal value may be determined on the basis of the price of the product in the country of origin, and not the price in the exporting country.

Importing countries have thus exercised significant discretion in the calculation of normal value of products exported from non-market economies.

**Determination of export price**  
**General rule** The export price will normally be based on the transaction price at which the foreign producer sells the product to an importer in the importing country. However, as is the case with normal value, the Agreement recognizes that this transaction price may not be appropriate for purposes of comparison.

**Exceptions** There may be no export price for a given product, for instance, if the export transaction is an internal transfer, or if the product is exchanged in a barter transaction. In addition, the transaction price at which the exporter sells the product to the importing country may be unreliable because of an association or a compensatory arrangement between the exporter and the importer or a third party. In such a case, the

transaction price may not be an arms-length market price, but may be manipulated, for instance for tax purposes. The Agreement recognizes that, in such cases, an alternative method of determining an appropriate export price for comparison is needed. Alternative method of calculation The Agreement provides that in circumstances where there is no export price, or where the export price is unreliable due to an association or compensatory arrangement between the exporter and the importer or a third party, an alternative method may be used to determine the export price. If the imported product is not resold to an independent buyer, or is not resold as imported, the authorities may determine a reasonable basis on which to calculate the export price. Fair comparison of normal value and export price Basic requirements The Agreement requires that a fair comparison of the export price and the normal value be made. The basic requirements for a fair comparison are that the prices being compared are those of sales made at the same level of trade, normally the ex-factory level, and of sales made at as nearly as possible the same time. Allowance To ensure that prices are comparable, the Agreement requires that adjustments be made to either the normal value, or the export price, or both, to account for differences in the product, or in the circumstances of sale, in the importing and exporting markets. These allowances must be made for differences in conditions and terms of sale, taxation, quantities, physical characteristics, and other differences demonstrated to affect price comparability. Adjustments in case of constructed export price The Agreement also provides specific rules on the adjustment to be made if the comparison of normal value is to a constructed export price. In those circumstances, allowance must be made for costs, including duties and taxes, incurred between the importation of the product and the resale to the first independent purchaser, as well as for profits accruing. If price comparability has been affected, the Agreement requires either that the normal value be established at a level of trade equivalent to that of the constructed export price, which is likely to require an adjustment, or allowance must be made for differences in conditions and terms of sale, taxation, quantities, physical characteristics, and other matters demonstrated to affect price comparability. Thus, the exchange rate used should be that in effect on the date of sale date of contract, invoice, purchase order or order confirmation, whichever establishes material terms of sale. If a forward currency sale is directly linked to export sale, the exchange rate of forward currency sale must be used. Calculation of dumping margins and duty assessment Calculation of dumping margins The Agreement contains rules governing the calculation of dumping margins. In this situation, if the investigating authorities provide an explanation as to why such differences cannot be taken into account in weighted average-to-weighted average or transaction-to-transaction comparisons, the weighted average normal value can be compared to the export prices on individual transactions. Refund or reimbursement The Agreement requires Members to collect duties on a non-discriminatory basis on imports from all sources found to be dumped and causing injury, except with respect to sources from which a price undertaking has been accepted. Moreover, the amount of the duty collected may not exceed the dumping margin, although it may be a lesser amount. The Agreement specifies two mechanisms to ensure that excessive duties are not collected. The choice of mechanism depends on the nature of the duty collection process. If a Member allows importation and collects an estimated anti-dumping duty, and only later calculates the specific amount of anti-dumping duty to be paid, the Agreement requires that the final determination of the amount must take place as soon as possible, upon request for a final assessment. Individual exporter dumping margins The Agreement requires that, when anti-dumping duties are imposed, a dumping margin be calculated for each exporter. However, it is recognized that this may not be possible in all cases, and thus the Agreement allows investigating authorities to limit the number of exporters, importers, or products individually considered, and impose an anti-dumping duty on uninvestigated sources on the basis of the weighted average dumping margin actually established for the exporters or producers actually examined. The investigating authorities are precluded from including in the calculation of that weighted average dumping margin any dumping margins that are de minimis, zero, or based on the facts available rather than a full investigation, and must calculate an individual margin for any exporter or producer who provides the necessary information during the course of the investigation. New shippers The Agreement makes provision for the assessment of anti-dumping duties on exports from producers or exporters who were not sources of imports considered during the period of investigation. While that review is in progress, the authorities may request guarantees or withhold appraisement on imports, but may not actually

collect anti-dumping duties on those imports.

### Chapter 2 : PPT - Sample Non Market-Economy NME Dumping Margin Calculation PowerPoint Presentation

*The dumping margin calculation is therefore fundamental for two reasons in antidumping investigations: (1) firstly, finding evidence of dumping is the first requirement for the introduction.*

Concluded Complaint by the European Communities. The European Communities considered that there was a disagreement as to the existence or consistency with a covered agreement of the measures taken to comply with the rulings and recommendations of the DSB. Therefore, on 9 July , the European Communities requested consultations under Article Brazil and Korea requested to join the consultation. On 13 September , the European Communities requested the establishment of a compliance panel. At its meeting on 25 September , the DSB agreed to refer, if possible, the matter raised by the European Communities to the original panel. India, Japan and Mexico reserved their third-party rights. On 30 November , the Director-General composed the Panel. On 26 May , the Chairman of the Panel informed the DSB that it would not be able to circulate its report within 90 days after the date of referral given the delays in the composition of the Panel and the schedule adopted after consultations with the parties. The Panel expected to complete its work in October On 17 December , the compliance panel report was circulated to Members. The compliance Panel first found that it had no authority to make findings with respect to the EC claim that the Panel was improperly constituted under Articles 8. With respect to the EC general claims of failure, by the United States, to fully implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in the original dispute, the compliance Panel found that: With respect to the EC claims that certain US measures taken to comply were inconsistent with the US obligations under the covered agreements, the compliance Panel made no finding with respect to Section determination in case 11, which it had found was not properly before it; the EC claims under Article 5. The Panel further found that, to the extent that the measures taken by the United States to comply with the recommendations and rulings adopted by the DSB in the original proceeding are inconsistent with the obligations of the United States under the covered agreements, and to the extent that the United States has otherwise failed to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB in the original dispute, these recommendations and rulings of the DSB remain operative. It therefore made no new recommendation. Appellate Body and Panel Reports Adopted On 12 June , the European Communities requested consultations with the United States concerning a methodology used by the US, among others, in the calculation of dumping margins, known as "zeroing". The "zeroing" methodology, generally speaking, involves treating specific price comparisons which do not show dumping as zero values in the calculation of a weighted average dumping margin. The request concerns specific provisions of the US Tariff Act of and the Department of Commerce implementing regulation as well as US Department of Commerce methodology and its determinations in specific cases involving products imported from the EC. The EC has indicated specific aspects of the zeroing methodology that it will raise in the consultations, including the way in which it is applied in calculating dumping margins, its impact on determinations of injury, its impact in cases which would otherwise be de minimis, and the level of the dumping margins in 21 specific US anti-dumping cases. The EC has attached to its request details of those specific cases, alleging that in each of them the US used zeroing methodology. Most of the products in these cases were steel. The EC asserts that in each case the dumping margin without zeroing would have been lower, de minimis or negative. On 27 June , India and Korea requested to join the consultations. On 30 June , Japan and Mexico requested to join the consultations. On 8 September , the European Communities requested further consultations with the United States. The EC wished to add ten more cases to the list of specific cases. The EC indicated specific aspects of the zeroing methodology that it will raise in the additional consultations, including the way in which it is applied in calculating dumping margins, its impact on determinations of injury, its impact in cases which would otherwise be de minimis, and the level of the dumping margins in specific US anti-dumping cases. On 25 September , Mexico requested to join the consultations. On 5 February , the EC requested the establishment of a panel. On 16 February , the EC submitted a revised request for the establishment of a panel. At its meeting on 17 February , the DSB deferred the establishment of a panel. At its meeting on 19 March , the DSB established a panel. On 23 March , Hong

Kong, China reserved its third-party right. On 30 March , Turkey reserved its third-party right. On 27 October , the Panel was composed. On 22 March , the Chairman of the Panel informed the DSB that it would not be possible for the Panel to complete its work in six months in light of the schedule which had been agreed after consultations with the parties, and that the Panel expected to complete its work in July . On 1 July , the Panel informed the DSB that due to its continued consideration of the issues in this dispute, it would not be possible for the Panel to complete its work by the end of July, and that the Panel expected to complete its work in September . On 31 October , the Panel Report was circulated to Members. The Panel also unanimously upheld the claims of the European Communities in respect of what was described by the Panel as the United States "methodology" of zeroing in original investigations. In doing so, the Panel found that the United States "methodology" of zeroing was a "norm" capable of being challenged in WTO dispute settlement proceedings. The dissenting member of the Panel would have upheld the claims of the European Communities as they relate to the 16 specific determinations of dumping in reviews as well as the United States "methodology" of zeroing in the context of reviews. The dissenting member of the Panel would also have found one provision of a United States regulation to be WTO-inconsistent in respect of reviews. At its meeting of 6 December , following a joint request by the parties, the DSB agreed to extend the time period for the adoption of the panel report until 31 January . On 17 January , the European Communities notified its decision to appeal to the Appellate Body certain issues of law covered in the panel report and certain legal interpretations developed by the Panel. On 30 January , the United States notified its decision to appeal to the Appellate Body certain issues of law covered in the panel report and certain legal interpretations developed by the Panel. On 15 March , the Chairman of the Appellate Body informed the DSB that it would not be able to circulate its report within the day period due to the time required for completion and translation of the report, and that it estimated it would be circulated to WTO Members no later than 18 April . On 18 April , the Appellate Body report was circulated to Members. At the DSB meeting on 24 April , the United States said that after the correction of a clerical error in the determination of one investigation, they would have fully implemented the DSB recommendations and rulings. The European Communities commended the United States for the steps it had taken to secure compliance, but said it was questionable if it had fully implemented the DSB recommendations and rulings. On 9 July , the European Communities requested consultations under Article . On 20 July , Brazil and Korea requested to join the consultations. On 13 September , the European Communities requested the establishment of an Article . At its meeting on 25 September , the DSB agreed, if possible, to refer the matter raised by the European Communities to the original panel.

*The calculation of the dumping margin is fundamental for two reasons in antidumping investigations: firstly it is a fundamental requirement for the introduction of an antidumping measure; in order to find dumping the dumping margin has to be greater than de minimis (i.e. less than 2%); secondly it defines the upper boundary of the antidumping.*

It is generally expressed as a percentage of the export price. As per Section 9A 6 of the Customs Tariff Act, , the margin of dumping as referred to in sub-section 1 or sub-section 2 shall be ascertained and determined by the Central Government, after such inquiry as it may consider necessary. The Central Government may make rules for the purposes of this section which may provide for the manner in which articles liable for any antidumping duty under this section may be identified, and for the manner in which the export price and the normal value of, and the margin of dumping in relation to, such articles may be determined and for the assessment and collection of such anti-dumping duty. As per Rule 22 of the Anti-Dumping Rules, which provides for margin of dumping for exporters not originally investigated, if a product is subject to anti-dumping duties, the Designated authority shall carry out a periodical review for the purpose of determining individual margins of dumping for any exporters or producers in the exporting country in question who have not exported the product to India during the period of investigation, provided that these exporters or producers show that they are not related to any of the exporters or producers in the exporting country who are subject to the anti-dumping duties on the product. The Central Government shall not levy anti-dumping Duties on imports from such exporters or producers during the period of review. However, the Central Government may resort to provisional assessment and may ask a guarantee from the importers if the designated authority so recommends and if such a review results in a determination of dumping in respect of such products or exporters, it may levy duty in such cases retrospectively from the date of the initiation of the review. The margin of dumping shall be considered de minimis if it is less than two percent of the export price. The Annexure- I of the Anti Dumping Rules, stipulates the principles governing the determination of normal value, export price and margin of dumping. As per this provision the designated authority while determining the normal value, export price and margin of dumping shall take into account inter alia, the following principles –

1. The elements of costs referred to in the context of determination of normal value shall normally be determined on the basis of records kept by the exporter or producer under investigation, provided such records are in accordance with the generally accepted accounting principles of the exporting country, and such records reasonably reflect the cost associated with production and sale of the article under consideration. Sales of the like product in the domestic market of the exporting country or sales to a third country at prices below per unit fixed and variable costs of production plus administrative, selling and general costs may be treated as not being in the ordinary course of trade by reason of price. The designated authority may disregard these sales, in determining normal value, provided it has determined that- i such sales are made within a reasonable period of time not less than six months in substantial quantities, i. The said prices will be considered to provide for recovery of costs within a reasonable period of time if they are above weighted average per unit costs for the period of investigation, even though they might have been below per unit costs at the time of sale. The amounts for administrative, selling and general costs and for profits as referred to in sub-section 1 of section 9A of the Act, shall be based on actual data pertaining to production and sales in the ordinary course of trade, of the like article by the exporter or producer under investigation. When such amounts cannot be determined on this basis, the amounts may be determined on the basis of: The designated authority, while arriving at a constructed export price, shall give due allowance for costs including duties and taxes, incurred between importation and resale and for profits. The comparison shall be made at the same level of trade, normally at the ex-factory level, and in respect of sales made at as nearly as possibly the same time. Due allowance shall be made in each case, on its merits, for differences which affect price comparability, including differences in conditions and in terms of sale, taxation, levels of trade, quantities, physical characteristics, and any other differences which are demonstrated to affect price comparability. Fluctuations in exchange rates shall be ignored and in an investigation the exporters shall be given at least sixty days to have

adjusted their export prices to reflect the sustained movements in exchange rates during the period of investigation. A normal value established on a weighted average basis may be compared to the prices of the individual export transactions if it is found that the pattern of export prices which differs significantly among different purchasers, regions or time periods and if an explanation is provided as to why such differences cannot be taken into account appropriately by the use of weighted average- to-weighted average or transaction-to-transaction comparison. In case of imports from non-market economy countries, normal value shall be determined on the basis if the price or constructed value in the market economy third country, or the price from such a third country to other countries, including India or where it is not possible, or on any other reasonable basis, including the price actually paid or payable in India for the like product, duly adjusted if necessary, to include a reasonable profit margin. An appropriate market economy third country shall be selected by the designated authority in a reasonable manner, keeping in view the level of development of the country concerned and the product in question, and due account shall be taken of any reliable information made available at the time of selection. Accounts shall be taken within time limits, where appropriate, of the investigation made in any similar matter in respect of any other market economy third country. The parties to the investigation shall be informed without any unreasonable delay the aforesaid selection of the market economy third country and shall be given a reasonable period of time to offer their comments. Provided, however, that the non-market economy country or the concerned firms from such country may rebut such a presumption by providing information and evidence to the designated authority that establishes that such country is not a non-market economy country on the basis of the criteria specified in sub-paragraph 3. Any country among them seeking to establish that it is a market economy country as per criteria enunciated in this paragraph, may provide all necessary information which shall be taken due account by the designated authority.

**Chapter 4 : WTO | Anti-dumping - Technical Information**

*the anti-dumping margin calculation. What is dumping? Dumping occurs where foreign producers are exporting their goods in our country at prices (called the "export price").*

Overview[ edit ] A standard technical definition of dumping is the act of charging a lower price for the like product in a foreign market than the normal value of the product, for example the price of the same product in a domestic market of the exporter or in a third country market. This is often referred to as selling at less than "normal value" on the same level of trade in the ordinary course of trade. Under the World Trade Organization WTO Antidumping Agreement , dumping is not prohibited unless it causes or threatens to cause material injury to a domestic industry in the importing country. The term has a negative connotation, as advocates of competitive markets see "dumping" as a form of unfair competition. Furthermore, advocates for workers and laborers believe that safeguarding businesses against such practices, such as dumping, help alleviate some of the harsher consequences of such practices between economies at different stages of development see protectionism. The Bolkestein directive , for example, was accused in Europe of being a form of "social dumping," as it favored competition between workers, as exemplified by the Polish Plumber stereotype. Ron Chernow points to the example of regional oil monopolies in Titan: The Life of John D. In another area where other independent businesses were already driven out, namely in Chicago , prices would be increased by a quarter. It is a sub part of the various forms of price discrimination and is classified as third-degree price discrimination. Opinions differ as to whether or not such practice constitutes unfair competition , but many governments take action against dumping to protect domestic industry. Its focus is on how governments can or cannot react to dumping&#x2014;it disciplines anti-dumping actions, and it is often called the "anti-dumping agreement". This focus only on the reaction to dumping contrasts with the approach of the subsidies and countervailing measures agreement. The legal definitions are more precise, but broadly speaking, the WTO agreement allows governments to act against dumping where there is genuine "material" injury to the competing domestic industry. There are many different ways of calculating whether a particular product is being dumped heavily or only lightly. The agreement narrows down the range of possible options. And the agreement also specifies how a fair comparison can be made between the export price and what would be a normal price. Five-percent rule[ edit ] According to footnote 2 of the Anti-Dumping Agreement, domestic sales of the like product are sufficient to base normal value on if they account for 5 percent or more of the sales of the product under consideration to the importing country market. This is often called the five-percent or home-market-viability test. This test is applied globally by comparing the quantity sold of a like product on the domestic market with the quantity sold to the importing market. For example, if the products are only sold on the foreign market, the normal value will have to be determined on another basis. Additionally, some products may be sold on both markets but the quantity sold on the domestic market may be small compared to quantity sold on foreign market. This situation happens often in countries with small domestic markets like Hong Kong and Singapore, though similar circumstances may also happen in larger markets. This is because of differences in factors like consumer taste and maintenance. Calculating the extent of dumping on a product is not enough. Anti-dumping measures can only be applied if the act of dumping is hurting the industry in the importing country. Therefore, a detailed investigation must first be conducted according to specified rules. The investigation must evaluate all relevant economic factors that have a bearing on the state of the industry in question; if it is revealed that dumping is taking place and hurting domestic industry, the exporting company can raise its price to an agreed level in order to avoid anti-dumping import duties. Anti-dumping measures must expire five years after the date of imposition, unless a review shows that ending the measure would lead to injury. Generally speaking, an anti-dumping investigation usually develops along the following steps: Then investigation to the foreign producer is conducted to determine if the allegation is valid. According to Article VI of GATT, dumping investigations shall, except in special circumstances, be concluded within one year, and in no case more than 18 months after initiation. Other conditions are also set. For example, the investigations also have to end if the volume of dumped imports is negligible i. The agreement says member countries must

inform the Committee on Anti-Dumping Practices about all preliminary and final anti-dumping actions, promptly and in detail. They must also report on all investigations twice a year. When differences arise, members are encouraged to consult each other. Actions in the United States[ edit ] In the United States , domestic firms can file an anti-dumping petition under the regulations determined by the U. Department of Commerce , which determines "less than fair value" and the International Trade Commission , which determines "injury". These proceedings operate on a timetable governed by U. The Department of Commerce has regularly found that products have been sold at less than fair value in U. Related to anti-dumping duties are " countervailing duties ". The difference is that countervailing duties seek to offset injurious subsidization while anti-dumping duties offset injurious dumping. Some commentators have noted that domestic protectionism, and lack of knowledge regarding foreign cost of production, lead to the unpredictable institutional process surrounding investigation. Members of the WTO can file complaints against anti-dumping measures. Because of the Asian financial crisis , October 27, mini-crash , and Russian financial crisis , the United States steel producers were severely harmed by a record surge of more than 40 million tons of cheap steel imports, resulting in the loss of more than 10, steel production jobs in , and was the imminent cause of three bankruptcies by medium-sized steel companies Acme Steel, Laclede Steel , and Geneva Steel , reduced volume, lower prices, and affecting the willingness of private banks and investment institutions to make loans to the U. Relevant discussion may be found on the talk page. Please help to ensure that disputed statements are reliably sourced. May Learn how and when to remove this template message European Union anti-dumping is under the purview of the European Commission. The bureaucratic entity responsible for advising member states on anti-dumping actions is the Directorate General Trade DG Trade in Brussels. Community industry can apply to have an anti-dumping investigation begin. DG Trade first investigates the standing of the complainants. The process is guided by quite specific guidance in the regulations. The DG Trade will make a recommendation to a committee known as the Anti-Dumping Advisory Committee, on which each member state has one vote. Member states abstaining will be treated as if they voted in favour of industrial protection , a voting system which has come under considerable criticism. Consumer interests and non-industry related interests "community interests" are not emphasized during an investigation. An investigation typically looks for damage caused by dumping to community producers, and the level of tariff set is based on the damage done to community producers by dumping. If consensus is not found, the decision goes to the European Council. If imposed, duties last for five years theoretically. In practice they last at least a year longer, because expiry reviews are usually initiated at the end of the five years, and during the review process the status quo is maintained. An example of an Anti-dumping duty action taken by the European Union is that of the anti-dumping duty imposed upon bicycle imports from China into the EU , which has recently be continued at a rate of Chinese economic situation[ edit ] This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. May Learn how and when to remove this template message The dumping investigation essentially compares domestic prices of the accused dumping nation with prices of the imported product on the European market. However, several rules are applied to the data before the dumping margin is calculated. Most contentious is the concept of "analogue market". Some exporting nations are not granted " market economy status " by the EU: China is a prime example because its market status is considered " state-sponsored capitalism ". In such cases, the DG Trade is prevented from using domestic prices as the fair measure of the domestic price. A particular export industry may also lose market status if the DG Trade concludes that this industry receives government assistance. Other tests applied include the application of international accounting standards and bankruptcy laws. The consequences of not being granted market economy status have a big impact on the investigation. For example, if China is accused of dumping widgets , the basic approach is to consider the price of widgets in China against the price of Chinese widgets in Europe. But China does not have market economy status, so Chinese domestic prices can not be used as the reference. Instead, the DG Trade must decide upon an analogue market: Brazil and Mexico have been used, but the United States is a popular analogue market. In this case, the price of widgets in the United States is regarded as the substitute for the price of widgets in China. This process of choosing an analogue market is subject to

the influence of the complainant, which has led to some criticism that it is an inherent bias in the process. China is now developing to a more free and open market, unlike its planned-economy in the early s, the market in China is more willing to embrace the global competition. It is thus required to improve its market regulations and conquer the free trade barriers to improve the situation and produce a properly judged pricing level to assess the "dumping" behaviour. In January , the Indian government imposed anti-dumping duty on colour coated steel products imported from the European Union and China for 6 months. The primary reason behind the probe was that the price differential between domestic and imported MDF stood at percent and net MDF imports was at around percent, majority of which came from Indonesia and Vietnam. On 26 October , India imposes anti-dumping duty on stainless steel from US, EU and China India has imposed anti-dumping duty on certain stainless steel products from the European Union and other nations including China and Korea, in order to protect the domestic industry from cheap imports. Abuse of Anti-dumping Measures[ edit ] Although anti-dumping measure has been provided as a vital rule in preventing protectionism and promote free trade, many instances of anti-dumping practices suggest that anti-dumping measures have been used as a tool of protectionism. The USA has been consistently alleged to have abused anti-dumping measures with its practice of Zeroing. Initially, the CAP sought to increase European agricultural production and provide support to European farmers through a process of market intervention whereby a special fund, the European Agricultural Guidance and Guarantee Fund , would buy up surplus agricultural produce if the price fell below the centrally-determined intervention level. European farmers were given a "guaranteed" price for their produce when it was sold in the European Community, and a system of export reimbursements ensured that European exports would sell at or below world prices, at no detriment to the European producer. The policy was heavily criticised as distorting world trade, and since , the policy has moved away from market intervention and towards direct payments to farmers regardless of production, called "decoupling". Furthermore, the payments are generally dependent on farmers fulfilling certain environmental or animal welfare requirements to encourage responsible, sustainable farming in what is termed "multifunctional" agricultural subsidies. Social, environmental and other benefits of subsidies would no longer not include a simple increase in production.

### Chapter 5 : Dumping (pricing policy) - Wikipedia

*The investigating authorities are precluded from including in the calculation of that weighted average dumping margin any dumping margins that are de minimis, zero, or based on the facts available rather than a full investigation, and must calculate an individual margin for any exporter or producer who provides the necessary information during.*

### Chapter 6 : dumping margin - Spanish translation â€“ Linguee

*margin of dumping Margin of Dumping is defined in Section 9A of the Customs Tariff Act, as the difference between the Normal value and the export price of the goods under complaint. It is generally expressed as a percentage of the export price.*

### Chapter 7 : Antidumping Margin Calculation Programs

*Calculation of dumping margins (1/3) Dumping Margin = Normal Value - Export Price Pursuant to 19 USCS Â§ 35 (A), the margin of dumping is "the amount by which the normal value exceeds the export price or constructed export price of the subject merchandise."*