

## **Submission – Anti-Dumping Framework and Supply Chain Impacts resulting in higher input costs for local fabricators**

I am writing in response to CS Traders application to raise concerns about the current anti-dumping framework across structural and related steel products. While reinforcing products are only one category, the current situation in that segment illustrates a broader problem. With Whyalla offline, local supply of reinforcing products is constrained, yet anti-dumping measures continue to limit the number of mills that can supply compliant material. The few remaining eligible mills are already operating at or near capacity, leaving importers and local distribution companies with little or no practical supply options.

The current situation within the reinforcing market is dire and leaves a significant amount of construction companies and their downstream processors open to litigation and damages if they cannot deliver their projects within the agreed timeframe as per contract.

This constraint is not limited to reinforcing. It reflects a broader pattern in which the parties who have initiated or benefit from anti-dumping measures appear to control supply access, creating a market that functions like a closed network. Independent distributors, including businesses like mine, are unable to purchase from local mills on competitive terms. The result of anti dumping duties once imposed does not promote more widespread distribution of Australian steel products, it merely wipes out local competition of which the local mills refuse to supply.

The same dynamic extends into downstream processes, including Hot Dip Galvanizing (HDG) and other finishing stages, where costs are 3 – 10 times more expensive depending on the fabricators account pricing, than being completed overseas. As an example, for most fabricators the HDG process in Australia costs more than the steel feed stock for the project, essentially doubling the cost, whereby getting fabricated steel HDG overseas generally increases the cost by about 10%.

The net effect is higher input costs for fabricators, reduced competition, and increased risk to supply reliability. Ultimately, these costs flow through to end users and taxpayers. There are products that we don't even produce in this country where anti dumping duties apply, these were introduced by an applicant in an attempt to corner the market and force the local distribution industry to purchase through their trading arm.

Currently, there are serious shortages in the below products, all of which supply is constrained due to lack of duty free options from offshore mills.

-Reinforcing products – DBIC, DBIL, Concrete mesh (current anti dumping investigation on these products)

-Certain products in the merchant bar range

-Large diameter RHS

As a practical step, I request that the Productivity Commission undertake a full review of the anti-dumping framework, including the relationship between local mills, applicants, and enforcement through Border Force. The reinforcing example shows how the current settings can create a closed network, limit supply options, and push costs up before fabrication even

begins. The real losers under the current settings are fabricators and, ultimately, end users and taxpayers.

A recalibrated framework that allows more qualified suppliers — both local and imported — would restore competition, reduce input costs, and strengthen supply resilience across the entire structural steel market.