檔號	/ /	保存年限	

經濟部國際貿易局　函

機關地址：臺北市湖口街1號
承 辦 人：吳承駿
聯絡電話：(02)23977249
傳　　真：(02)23584339
電子郵件：wuchengjiun@trade.gov.tw

24159
新北市三重區重新路5段609巷6號3樓之3

受文者：台灣醫療暨生技器材工業同業公會

台灣醫療暨生技器材工業同業公會 收 105.11.14 文 檔號：105784

裝

發文日期：中華民國105年11月10日
發文字號：貿雙一字第1050010814號
速別：最速件
密等及解密條件或保密期限：
附件：如文(4頁)(1050010814-1.pdf)

主旨：有關駐印度代表處經濟組出席印度商工部反傾銷局於105年11月7日舉辦之過氧化氫(Hydrogen Peroxide)及彈性纖維紗(Elastomeric Filament Yarn)反傾銷調查案公聽會事，請查照並轉知廠商參考因應。

訂

說明：

一、依據駐印度代表處經濟組105年11月8日竺經字第10500005060號函辦理；本局105年11月1日貿雙一字第1050010314號函及105年11月4日貿雙一字第1050010450號函諒達。

二、印度經濟組已於旨揭日期出席公聽會，並說明調查期間(POI)印度自我國進口過氧化氫及彈性纖維紗占其總進口量僅略高於3%，數量甚低，印方應依反傾銷協定第5.8條終止對我國之調查。

線

正本：中華民國全國工業總會、台灣肥皂清潔劑工業同業公會、台灣區酸鹼工業同業公會、臺灣環境衛生用藥工業同業公會、台灣醫療暨生技器材工業同業公會、財團法人中華民國紡織業拓展會、台灣區人造纖維製造工業同業公會、薛恒興彈性纖維工業股份有限公司
副本：本局局長室、副局長室、貿易服務組、綜合企劃委員會（均含附件）、駐印度代表處經濟組（不含附件）

局長 楊珍妮

依照分層負責規定授權單位主管決行

雙邊貿易一組

機號	/	保存年限
	/ /	

駐印度代表處經濟組 函

機關地址：34 Paschimi Marg, Vasant Vihar, New Delhi-110057, India
承辦人：謝丞淵
聯絡電話：91-11-4607-7722
電子郵件：cyhsieh@moea.gov.tw

受文者：經濟部國際貿易局
發文日期：中華民國 105 年 11 月 8 日
發文字號：竺經字第 10500005060號
速別：最速件
密等及解密條件或保密期限：普通
附件：如文(共 3 頁)

裝

主旨：有關本組出席印度商工部反傾銷局舉辦之過氧化氫(Hydrogen Peroxide)及彈性纖維紗(Elastomeric Filament Yarn)反傾銷調查案公聽會事，請查照。

說明：

訂

一、本組 105 年 11 月 1 日竺經字第 10500004980 號函、10 月 28 日竺經字第 10500004900 號函諒達。

二、本組已於本(105)年 11 月 7 日分別出席旨述兩公聽會，公聽會由新任之印度商工部助理次長兼反傾銷局局長 Dr Inder Jit Singh 主持，楊組長於會中說明 2011-14 年間自我國進口之過氧化氫產品佔總進口量均低於 3%。另於調查期間自我國進口之過氧化氫及彈性纖維紗二產品分別佔總進口量略高於 3%，數量甚低，印方應依反傾銷協定第 5.8 條終止對我國之調查。

線

三、本組已於會後提交我國公聽會發言資料(如附件 1, 2)予該局參考。

正本：經濟部國際貿易局
副本：

105. 11 0 9

東北亞

經濟部國際貿易局
1050010814

國際貿易局
傳真收文

PART 1

STATEMENT OF TAIWAN CONCERNING "HYDROGEN PEROXIDE"

Government of Taiwan would like to bring to the attention of the Hon'ble Designated Authority that there were no imports from Taiwan during 2011-12 and 2012-13. Imports started in 2013-14 with a negligible volume of 40 MT and it was only 1996 MT during the POI constituting just slightly above the de minimis level of 3% of imports from all sources. Even during POI, volume of imports from Taiwan accounted for less than 1% of the total demand for the like product in India.

Taiwan requests Indian authority to use its discretion judiciously and not to cumulate the imports from Taiwan along with the imports from other countries in this particular case considering the very low volume of imports as well as the current level of bilateral cooperation between the two countries.

Taiwan requests Indian authority to explore the possibility of not imposing any measures against the imports coming from Taiwan.

B/3/#2

Statement of Taiwan for Public Hearing

1. The Government of Taiwan presents its compliments and thanks the Designated Authority, DGAD ("DA") for affording Taiwan this opportunity.

2. Taiwan would like to raise certain issues that are critical in this case.

3. Taiwan believes that clarity on import volume from subject countries, particularly from Taiwan, is necessary. As per the petition, imports from Taiwan are too low – only 2% in demand, 3.75% in subject countries, and 3.2% in total imports during the POI. It is conceivable that imports from Taiwan could be negligible during the POI. Therefore, correctness of the import volume should be examined. If imports from Taiwan are slightly above 3% during the POI, the present investigation against Taiwan could be terminated in terms of Article 5.8 of the Anti-dumping Agreement.

4. It should be noted that the domestic industry's annual capacity was only one-third of the Indian demand during the POI. Further, the domestic industry's production was mere 4,700 MT and sales were about 3600 MT, while demand in India was above 14,000 MT during the POI. Imports are, thus, a necessity to fill the huge demand-supply gap of above 10,000 MT.

5. The domestic industry's performance has improved across all economic parameters during the injury analysis period, viz., production, sales, capacity utilisation, selling price, productivity, and profitability.

6. The selling price of the domestic industry seems much higher than their cost of sales. There does not appear to be any price depression or price suppression.

7. With such positive performance, it cannot be said that the domestic industry is suffering material injury due to imports from the subject countries, particularly, from Taiwan.

8. We feel that there are other factors that may be causing injury to the domestic industry. These are i) high fixed costs of the domestic industry, since their plant is new, which commenced production only in March 2012, ii) the domestic industry is exporting at prices lower than its domestic selling prices, and iii) low quality of the domestic industry's products.

9. In fact, the domestic industry had earlier approached the DG Safeguards concerning this product. The DG Safeguards issued final findings on 29 September 2014 terminating the investigation and made the following observations on the actual reasons for serious injury:

   i. The domestic industry set up its plant in Himachal Pradesh expecting backward area benefit, which they were not able to avail;

   ii. Logistics cost was too high for the domestic industry due to the terrain, which adds 3% extra cost to finished products, besides attracting 1% central sales tax for sales to customers outside Himachal Pradesh;

   iii. The domestic industry is unable to command a price equal to or higher than import price, presumably due to quality issues;

   iv. Major production of the domestic industry was exported at prices lower than domestic selling price.

10. If the above factors have continued to affect the domestic industry, then levy of anti-dumping duty cannot alleviate the intrinsic difficulties of the domestic industry.

11. This investigation should be terminated as causal link between alleged dumped imports and alleged material injury is not established.

12. We would be happy to provide any clarification and further assist the DA during this investigation. With this, we thank the DA for affording Taiwan this opportunity.