

檔 號	/	/	保存年限
--------	---	---	------

經濟部國際貿易局 函

機關地址：台北市湖口街1號

承辦人：鄭悅庭

聯絡電話：(02)23977216

傳真：(02)23216445

電子郵件：yuting@trade.gov.tw

受文者：台灣區自行車輸出業同業公會（電傳）

發文日期：中華民國102年10月11日

發文字號：貿多字第1027023558號

速別：最速件

密等及解密條件或保密期限：

附件：如文（請至本局附件下載區下載<https://att.trade.gov.tw/>，識別碼：rMCw3）

主旨：有關加拿大國際貿易法庭(CITT)頃公告撤銷對自我國及中國大陸進口之部分自行車反傾銷命令事，請查照並轉知相關會員廠商。

說明：

- 一、依據駐加拿大代表處經濟組本（102）年10月7日加經(13)字第10200003330號函（如附件1）辦理；相關文號：本局本年8月12日貿多字第1027018330號函諒邀察及。
- 二、CITT頃於本年10月1日致函通知我方（如附件2）已完成對旨揭產品之期中複查（interim review）並提供理由書，相關重點略以（完整來函與理由書亦詳附件2）：依據該理由書第17及第19段，CITT認為因加國國內既已停止生產涉案產品，且近期內不可能再恢復生產，故即使 CITT撤銷本案反傾銷命令，加國自行車產業之損害亦不可能持續或再發生。因此，CITT認為此反傾銷命令已無維持之必要，爰決定予以撤銷。

正本：台灣區自行車輸出業同業公會（電傳）

副本：中華民國全國工業總會（含附件）、本局雙邊貿易二組、駐加拿大代表處經濟組

局長 張俊福

檔 號	/ /	保存 年限
--------	-----	----------

駐加拿大代表處經濟組 函

機關地址：45 O'Connor Street, Suite
1960, Ottawa, Ontario,

承辦人：吳文忠
聯絡電話：1-613-231-5025

受文者：經濟部國際貿易局

發文日期：中華民國102年10月7日
發文字號：加經(13)字第10200003330號
速別：最速件
密等及解密條件或保密期限：
附件：如文（共9頁）（CITT.pdf）

主旨：有關加國國際貿易法庭(Canada International Trade Tribunal, CITT)頃決定對原產地或出口國為我國及中國大陸之部分自行車反傾銷期中複查案撤銷反傾銷命令事，敬請 查照。

說明：

- 一、依據加國國際貿易法庭本(102)年10月1日致本組函辦理。
- 二、本案L秘書來函要點摘陳如下：

（一）本案涉案之自行車產品，包括組裝或未組裝、輪徑超過16英吋以上、原產地或出口國為我國及中國大陸之部分自行車，但排除FOB售價價格超過225加元及可折疊式自行車。

（二）另依據本案加方提供之「判決理由書」第17及第19段說明，該法庭認為因加國國內已停止生產涉案產品，且近期内不可能再恢復生產，故即使CITT撤銷此反傾銷命令，加國自行車產業之損害亦不可能持續或再發生。因此，CITT認為此反傾銷命令已無維持之必要，爰決定予以撤銷。

- 一、檢附加方來函暨英文版「判決理由書」影本各1份，併請查參。

國際貿易局 102/10/08



貿多 1027023558

正本：經濟部國際貿易局

副本：電子公文交換章
2013/10/08 09:57:42

駐加拿大代表處經濟組



Canadian International
Trade Tribunal

Tribunal canadien du
commerce extérieur

October 1, 2013

Ms. A.J.H. Chow
Director of Economic Division
Taipei Economic and Cultural Office
Suite 1960
45 O'Connor Street
Ottawa, Ontario K1P 1A4

Dear Ms. Chow:

Subject: Bicycles (Interim Review Nos. RD-2013-001 and RD-2013-002)

Please find enclosed a copy of the Canadian International Trade Tribunal's order and statement of reasons, in English and French, respecting a request for an interim review of its order made in Expiry Review No. RR-2011-002 concerning bicycles, assembled or unassembled, with wheel diameters of 16 inches (40.64 cm) and greater, originating in or exported from Chinese Taipei and the People's Republic of China, excluding bicycles with an FOB Chinese Taipei or People's Republic of China selling price exceeding CAN\$225 and excluding bicycles with foldable frames and stems.

Pursuant to paragraph 76.01(5)(a) of the *Special Import Measures Act*, the Canadian International Trade Tribunal hereby rescinds its order made on December 7, 2012, in Expiry Review No. RR-2011-002 concerning the above-mentioned bicycles.

Yours sincerely,

Dominique Laporte
Secretary

Encl.

333 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G7
Tél.: (613) 990-2452
Fax.: (613) 990-2439
www.citt-rcce.gc.ca

333, avenue Laurier ouest
Ottawa (Ontario) K1A 0G7
Tél. : (613) 990-2452
Télééc. : (613) 990-2439
www.rcce-citt.gc.ca

RECEIVED OCT 03 2013
13-0673



Canadian International
Trade Tribunal

Tribunal canadien du
commerce extérieur

CANADIAN
INTERNATIONAL
TRADE TRIBUNAL

Dumping and Subsidizing

ORDER AND REASONS

Interim Reviews Nos. RD-2013-001
and RD-2013-002

Bicycles

*Order issued
Monday, September 30, 2013*

Canada

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ORDER.....	i
STATEMENT OF REASONS	1
BACKGROUND.....	1
INITIATION OF AN INTERIM REVIEW	1
POSITIONS OF PARTIES.....	2
Submissions in Support of the Rescission of the Order	2
Submissions in Opposition to the Rescission of the Order	2
ANALYSIS	2
DECISION	3

IN THE MATTER OF interim reviews, pursuant to subsection 76.01(1) of the *Special Import Measures Act*, of the order made by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal on December 7, 2012, in Expiry Review No. RR-2011-002, continuing its order made on December 10, 2007, in Expiry Review No. RR-2006-001, continuing, with amendment, its order made on December 9, 2002, in Expiry Review No. RR-2002-001, continuing, with amendment, its order made on December 10, 1997, in Review No. RR-97-003, continuing, with amendment, its finding made on December 11, 1992, in Inquiry No. NQ-92-002, concerning:

**BICYCLES ORIGINATING IN OR EXPORTED FROM CHINESE TAIPEI AND
THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA**

ORDER

The Canadian International Trade Tribunal, pursuant to subsection 76.01(1) of the *Special Import Measures Act*, has conducted an interim review of its order made in Expiry Review No. RR-2011-002 in respect of bicycles, assembled or unassembled, with wheel diameters of 16 inches (40.64 cm) and greater, originating in or exported from Chinese Taipei and the People's Republic of China, excluding bicycles with an FOB Chinese Taipei or People's Republic of China selling price exceeding CAN\$225 and excluding bicycles with foldable frames and stems.

Pursuant to paragraph 76.01(5)(a) of the *Special Import Measures Act*, the Canadian International Trade Tribunal hereby rescinds its order made on December 7, 2012, in Expiry Review No. RR-2011-002 concerning the above-mentioned bicycles.

Pasquale Michael Saroli

Pasquale Michael Saroli
Presiding Member

Serge Fréchette

Serge Fréchette
Member

Jason W. Downey

Jason W. Downey
Member

Dominique Laporte

Dominique Laporte
Secretary

Tribunal Members: Pasquale Michael Saroli, Presiding Member
Serge Fréchette, Member
Jason W. Downey, Member

Research Director: Audrey Chapman

Counsel for the Tribunal: Alexandra Pietrzak

Manager, Registrar Programs and Services: Michel Parent

Senior Registrar Officer: Lindsay Vincelli

PARTICIPANTS:

Domestic Producer **Counsel/Representatives**
Raleigh Canada Limited C.J. Michael Flavell, Q.C.
Geoffrey C. Kubrick
Jonathan O'Hara

Importers/Exporters/Others **Counsel/Representatives**
Action Traders Ltd. Peter Clark
Renée Clark
Golsa Ghamari
Bicycle Trade Association of Canada James McIlroy
Canadian Tire Corporation, Limited Riyaz Dattu
Stephanie Fularczuk
Luiz Arthur Bihari
Hangzhou Joy Kie Industrial Trading Co., Ltd. Peter Clark
Joysun (Zhejiang) Manufacturing Co., Ltd.
Shenzhen Taifeng Yongda Bicycles Co., Ltd.
Specialized Bicycle Components Canada, Inc. Paul K. Lepsoe
Giant Manufacturing Co., Ltd. Bonnie Tu
Outdoor Gear Canada David Bowman
Taiwan Bicycle Exporters' Association Antony Lo
Trek Bicycle Corporation Michael J. Hietpas

Please address all communications to:

The Secretary
Canadian International Trade Tribunal
15th Floor
333 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G7

Telephone: 613-993-3595
Fax: 613-990-2439
E-mail: secretary@citt-tcct.gc.ca

STATEMENT OF REASONS

BACKGROUND

1. The Canadian International Trade Tribunal (the Tribunal) received two requests, pursuant to subsection 76.01(1) of the *Special Import Measures Act*,¹ for interim reviews and the rescission of the order that it issued in *Bicycles*² in respect of bicycles, assembled or unassembled, with wheel diameters of 16 inches (40.64 cm) and greater, originating in or exported from Chinese Taipei and the People's Republic of China (China), excluding bicycles with an FOB Chinese Taipei or China selling price exceeding CAN\$225 and excluding bicycles with foldable frames and stems (the subject goods).
2. On July 22, 2013, the Tribunal received a request for an interim review from Outdoor Gear Canada (OGC) (Interim Review No. RD-2013-001). On July 31, 2013, the Tribunal received a second request for an interim review from Trek Bicycle Corporation (Trek) (Interim Review No. RD-2013-002).³
3. In accordance with rule 6.1 of the *Canadian International Trade Tribunal Rules*,⁴ the Tribunal combined the two proceedings, given their similarities.

INITIATION OF AN INTERIM REVIEW

4. On August 8, 2013, the Tribunal initiated an interim review on its own initiative. In the Tribunal's view, an interim review was warranted in light of evidence that circumstances had changed since the making of the order, i.e. domestic production of bicycles had ceased.
5. In accordance with paragraph 25(c) of the *Rules*, the Tribunal decided to conduct the interim review by way of written submissions.
6. On September 4, 2013, the Tribunal received written submissions in support of the rescission of the order from OGC and Trek. On September 5, 2013, the Tribunal received additional submissions in support of the rescission of the order from the Bicycle Trade Association of Canada (BTAC), Giant Manufacturing Co., Ltd. (Giant) and the Taiwan Bicycle Exporters' Association (TBEA).
7. On September 5, 2013, the Tribunal received a written submission opposing the rescission of the order from Action Traders Ltd. (Action Traders), an importer of bicycles from China. The Tribunal notes that Raleigh Canada Limited (Raleigh), the sole domestic producer when the order was made, did not file a submission in opposition to the rescission of the order.
8. On September 11 and 12, 2013, respectively, OGC and the BTAC filed submissions in reply to Action Traders' submission.

1. R.S.C. 1985, c. S-15 [*SIMA*].

2. (7 December 2012), RR-2011-002 (CITT).

3. The Tribunal received essentially identical requests in January 2013 (Request for Interim Review Nos. RD-2012-002 and RD-2012-003). Its order and reasons for not initiating an interim review at that time were issued on March 27, 2013.

4. S.O.R./91-499 [*Rules*].

POSITIONS OF PARTIES

Submissions in Support of the Rescission of the Order

9. OGC and Trek requested that the Tribunal rescind the order on the basis of two announcements made by Raleigh's foreign parent, Accell Group N.V. (Accell Group). On January 15, 2013, Accell Group announced that Raleigh would be ceasing domestic production in June 2013. In addition, on July 26, 2013, Accell Group issued a press release, which stated the following:

In Canada, as announced in the beginning of the year, Accell Group terminated the production and assembly activities in Waterloo (Quebec) as of the end of June 2013. The sales organisation has been adapted, which will now focus entirely on the specialist retail and multi-sports channel, as Accell Group does in the US. The premises in Oakville (Ontario) have been sold. The reorganisation will make a positive contribution to Accell Group results from 2014.⁵

10. OGC and Trek submitted that, with the cessation of domestic production, the order was no longer required and should therefore be rescinded immediately.

11. Likewise, the BTAC, Giant and the TBEA submitted that, since there is no domestic production, there can no longer be injury to a domestic industry and that, therefore, the order should be rescinded immediately.

Submissions in Opposition to the Rescission of the Order

12. Action Traders acknowledged that there was no current domestic production, but contended that the rescission of the order would result in the resumption of the dumping of the subject goods and instability in the domestic market.⁶

13. Action Traders further submitted that it was seeking out locations in Canada that, in its view, might be financially reasonable and attractive to test-run production.⁷ However, as noted by the BTAC, Action Traders did not submit any credible evidence of any substantial commitment to re-establish the domestic production of bicycles similar to the subject goods.⁸

ANALYSIS

14. The purpose of an interim review is to determine whether the circumstances require a finding or order to be rescinded or continued, with or without amendment.⁹ This is consistent with Article 11.1 of the World Trade Organization (WTO) *Agreement on Implementation of Article VI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994* and Article 21.1 of the WTO *Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures*, which provide that a duty "... shall remain in force only as long as and to the extent necessary ..." to counteract the dumping or subsidizing which is causing injury to a domestic industry.

15. In this case, the uncontroverted evidence on the record indicates that domestic production ceased in June 2013. In addition, the Tribunal is not convinced that domestic production is likely to resume in the near future.

5. Exhibit RD-2013-001-01A, Vol. 1 at 6.

6. Exhibit RD-2013-001-04.06, Vol. 1 at 5.

7. *Ibid.* at 4.

8. Exhibit RD-2013-001-06.02, Vol. 1 at para. 16.

9. Subsection 76.01(5) of *SIIMA*.

16. In *Certain Stainless Steel Round Bar*,¹⁰ where domestic production had ceased, the Tribunal stated as follows:

15. In these circumstances, with no domestic production in the near future, the Tribunal finds that it is unlikely that injury will continue or recur if the duties are removed and, therefore, that the Finding and the Order are no longer necessary.

16. If and when domestic production resumes, the domestic industry will have recourse to seek remedial action should it believe that injurious dumping or subsidization has recurred or is likely to recur.

✓ 17. The same rationale applies in this case. As there is no domestic production, and as it is unlikely that domestic production will resume in the near future, it is unlikely that injury to a domestic industry will continue or recur if the current order is rescinded. The Tribunal therefore finds that the order is no longer necessary.

18. Should Action Traders or any other entity seek to re-establish domestic production and dumping of the subject goods continues or resumes, its recourse would be to file a complaint with the Canada Border Services Agency pursuant to section 31 of *SIMA*.

DECISION

✓ 19. Having found that the order is no longer necessary, the Tribunal hereby rescinds the order pursuant to paragraph 76.01(5)(a) of *SIMA*.

Pasquale Michael Saroli
Pasquale Michael Saroli
Presiding Member

Serge Fréchette
Serge Fréchette
Member

Jason W. Downey
Jason W. Downey
Member

10. (18 January 2005), RD-2004-003 to RD-2004-007 (CITT).