

PUBLIC

CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL TRADE TRIBUNAL

Analytic Report

CANADIAN SHIPMENTS, EMPLOYMENT AND IMPORTS AFFECTED BY ANTI-DUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING MEASURES 1995-2011

Research Team

Shawn JeffreyManager of Statistics
Stéphane RacetteStatistician
Alexandra BachelorResearch Assistant

Approved by:

Rose Ritcey
Director General

Date:

December 2012

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	2
METHODOLOGY	3
RESULTS	5

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1 - Impact of Anti-dumping and Countervailing Measures on Shipments, Employment and Imports	5
Table 2 - Percentage of Total Canadian Shipments, Employment and Imports Affected	6
Table 3 - Canadian Anti-dumping and Countervailing Measures 1995-2011	13

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
APPENDIX I – METHODOLOGY	7
APPENDIX II - MEASURES AND FINDINGS.....	13

SUMMARY

The trade remedies decisions of the Canadian International Trade Tribunal (the Tribunal) have an impact on Canadian shipments and employment in the manufacturing and agricultural sectors, and on imports of goods into Canada.

International trade agreements allow countries to protect their industries against the harmful effects of dumping or subsidizing. Dumping occurs when goods are exported at prices that are lower than the selling price of comparable goods in the home country or when goods are exported at unprofitable prices. Subsidizing occurs when goods imported into a country benefit from foreign government financial assistance.

In Canada, the *Special Import Measures Act (SIMA)* is the law that protects producers from unfair import competition. The Tribunal and the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) are jointly responsible for administering *SIMA*. The CBSA's role is to determine whether dumping or subsidizing has occurred. The Tribunal's role is to determine whether the dumping or subsidizing is financially injuring or threatening to injure Canadian producers.

If the Tribunal determines that dumped or subsidized imports are injuring or threatening to injure Canadian producers, the CBSA collects anti-dumping or countervailing duties on the imported goods. These duties give Canadian producers an opportunity to compete fairly with the goods in question. After anti-dumping or countervailing measures are put in place, imports of the product tend to decrease (at least for the specific countries covered by the measure), while Canadian shipments of the product and related employment tend to increase.

Anti-dumping and countervailing measures ordinarily lapse at the end of five years, unless a finding or order is reviewed and continued, in which case the duties will be collected for another five years.

This report evaluates the impact of anti-dumping and countervailing measures by estimating what shipments, employment and imports would have been if average "pre-measure" market trends had continued.

As of December 31, 2011, there were 31 anti-dumping and countervailing measures and they affected \$8.2 billion in Canadian shipments, nearly 20,000 jobs and more than \$1 billion in imports.

Over time, the number of Canadian anti-dumping and countervailing measures has decreased substantially. However, the importance of each measure in terms of its impact on shipments, jobs and imports has increased. From 2007 to 2011, the average impact per measure on shipments and imports more than doubled, while the number of jobs affected per measure increased by more than 75 percent.

INTRODUCTION

Since 1990, the research staff of the Tribunal has occasionally produced reports on Canada's use of anti-dumping and countervailing measures.¹

This report updates a similar report from 2011² and presents estimates of shipments, employment and imports affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures for the period from 1995 to 2011.

“Measure” is the unit for counting Tribunal findings and orders in this report.³

Measures are country-specific. When a Tribunal finding or an order affects imports from more than one country, it is counted as more than one measure. For example, the Tribunal's finding in Inquiry No. NQ-2000-006 (*Garlic*) represents two measures: one for the People's Republic of China (China) and one for Vietnam.

However, when a case involves classes of goods from the same country, it is counted as one measure. For example, in Inquiry No. NQ-2000-001 (*Refrigerators, Dishwashers and Dryers*), the Tribunal made separate findings on refrigerators, dishwashers and dryers from the United States. Yet, these three findings represent one measure.

-
1. *Canada's Use of the GATT Anti-dumping Code* (June 1991); *The Import Coverage of Tribunal Injury Findings* (July 1994); *Canadian & International Use of Anti-dumping and Countervailing Measures* (July 1995); *Canadian & International Use of Anti-dumping and Countervailing Measures—Data Update—1988-1994* (May 1996); *Canadian & International Use of Anti-dumping and Countervailing Measures—1988-1995* (May 1997); *Canadian Imports Affected by Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures, 1995-2002* (November 2003); *Canadian Imports Affected by Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures, 1995-2003* (April 2004); and *Canadian Imports Affected by Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures, 1995-2004* (July 2005).
 2. *Canadian Imports, Shipments and Employment Affected by Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Measures, 1995-2010* (October 2011).
 3. Measures as used in this report are different than “actions” as used by the World Trade Organization (WTO) in its reports. The most important difference is that when a case involves both anti-dumping and countervailing duties on products from the same country, this report counts one measure, while a WTO report would count two actions.

METHODOLOGY

The actual values of shipments, employment and imports in the years following imposition of anti-dumping and countervailing measures do not accurately reflect the extent to which the measures affected those indicators. This is because anti-dumping and countervailing measures generally result in increased prices of imports covered by the measures, which means imports of those products tend to decrease, while Canadian shipments and employment tend to increase.

So, a better evaluation of the impact of anti-dumping and countervailing measures is to estimate what shipments, employment and imports would have been in the absence of the measures. This is called a “counterfactual” assessment.

To do this assessment, Tribunal staff first established a database of the market values, import values (by subject country), shipment values and employment levels for all Tribunal findings and orders for the period from 1995 to 2011.⁴ The values are taken from the pre-hearing staff reports prepared for the relevant cases.⁵

Essentially, the estimation approach is as follows:

Step 1: Establish “base values” of shipments, employment and imports for each product.

Base values = average of values in the three calendar years prior to the CBSA’s preliminary determination (PD) of dumping or subsidizing.⁶

Step 2: Estimate the “pre-measure trend” for each product.

Pre-measure trend = average annual change in the market value of the product over the three calendar years prior to the PD.

Step 3: Use the pre-measure market trend to adjust the base values for each year that a measure is in place.

For the first calendar year following implementation of a measure, multiply the base values by the pre-measure trend. For the subsequent four years, multiply the pre-measure trend by the previous year’s estimated shipment, employment and import values.

4. Data on affected employment only cover the period from 2007 to 2011.

5. As part of its injury inquiries and expiry reviews, the Tribunal sends questionnaires to Canadian producers, as well as to importers and foreign producers, to collect relevant information, including three full years of data on domestic and foreign production levels, the volume and value of imports, domestic sales and exports, and the financial results of Canadian producers. The information obtained through the questionnaires is presented in a comprehensive report called a “pre-hearing staff report”, which becomes part of the case record.

6. Using a three-year average reduces the impact of the period just prior to the PD, when there are often significant increases or decreases in the market, depending on how the domestic industry reacts to the presence of dumped or subsidized imports.

Step 4: For a given year, sum the estimates of shipments, employment and imports affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures across the applicable products.

For example, suppose that at the end of 2010 there were two measures in place, each covering a single product from a single country. One measure had been implemented in 2009 and the other measure had been implemented in 2008. Suppose the base values for shipments and pre-measure trends were as shown:

Product	Measure Implemented	Base Value – Shipments	Pre-market Trend
Product 1	2009	\$1,000,000	5%
Product 2	2008	\$2,000,000	(4)%

Therefore, in 2010, the impact of these two measures on shipments would be:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &(\$1,000,000 \times 1.05) + [(\$2,000,000 \times 0.96) \times 0.96] \\
 &= \$1,050,000 + \$1,843,200 \\
 &= \$2,893,200
 \end{aligned}$$

Anti-dumping and countervailing measures ordinarily lapse at the end of five years, unless a finding or order is reviewed and continued, in which case the duties will be collected for another five years.

When the Tribunal reviews anti-dumping and countervailing measures, staff typically collect information on market values for the three calendar years prior to the start of the review. This means that *actual* market trends can be calculated for those years. For the other two years of the review period, an average annual change in the market is estimated.

The values of affected shipments and imports and employment levels are recalculated for each year of the review period using either actual market trends or estimated average annual changes.

These “retroactive” adjustments mean that results for the previous five years will change each time a new report is published. For example, in this year’s report, values for shipments and imports are different than in the 2010 report for the five years from 2006 to 2010. In the case of employment, the results are different for 2007 to 2010 since employment data were not available prior to 2007.

Appendix I gives details on the estimation methodology and addresses certain special issues.

RESULTS

Table 1 summarizes the results of the evaluation of the impact of anti-dumping and countervailing measures on shipments, employment and imports.

Highlights are:

- Decrease in the number of measures by 67 percent from 1995 to 2011.
- Increase in the value of shipments affected per measure by nearly 450 percent from 1995 to 2011.
- Increase in the employment affected per measure by approximately 75 percent from 2007 to 2011.
- Increase in imports affected per measure by nearly 200 percent from 1995 to 2011.

Table 1
Impact of Anti-dumping and Countervailing Measures on Shipments, Employment and Imports

<u>Year</u>	<u>Measures in Place on December 31</u>	<u>Shipments Affected</u>		<u>Employment Affected</u>		<u>Imports Affected</u>	
		<u>\$ Million</u>	<u>\$ Million/Measure</u>	<u>Employees</u>	<u>Employees/Measure</u>	<u>\$ Million</u>	<u>\$ Million/Measure</u>
1995	95	4,644	49	N/A	N/A	1,091	11
1996	94	4,820	51	N/A	N/A	984	10
1997	90	4,854	54	N/A	N/A	1,031	11
1998	76	4,115	54	N/A	N/A	876	12
1999	77	5,709	74	N/A	N/A	858	11
2000	78	6,646	85	N/A	N/A	1,150	15
2001	93	5,898	63	N/A	N/A	1,198	13
2002	89	5,739	64	N/A	N/A	1,085	12
2003	91	5,366	59	N/A	N/A	943	10
2004	80	6,081	76	N/A	N/A	910	11
2005	57	5,222	92	N/A	N/A	846	15
2006	38	4,811	127	N/A	N/A	623	16
2007	39	4,553	117	14,255	365.5	551	14
2008	39	5,584	143	15,310	392.6	709	18
2009	35	5,353	153	14,589	416.8	823	24
2010	31	7,776	251	19,763	637.5	1,029	33
2011	31	8,243	266	19,787	638.3	1,032	33

Source: Tribunal Research Branch Database and Statistics Canada

Table 2 compares the value of affected shipments, employment and imports to total Canadian shipments, employment and imports⁷.

7. These are derived from Statistics Canada data. The value of total Canadian shipments is the sum of the value of farm cash receipts and manufacturing shipments, less total Canadian merchandise exports in agricultural and manufactured products. Total Canadian employment is the sum of employment in agricultural and manufacturing industries. Total Canadian imports is the total value of Canadian imports of agricultural and manufactured products, less re-exports of these products.

Highlights are:

- Increase of 21 percent in the portion of total Canadian shipments affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures from 1995 to 2011.
- Increase of 60 percent in the portion of total Canadian employment affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures from 2007 to 2011.
- Decrease of nearly 50 percent in the portion of total Canadian imports affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures from 1995 to 2011.

Table 2
Percentage of Total Canadian Shipments, Employment and Imports Affected

<u>Year</u>	<u>Measures in Place on December 31</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Canadian Shipments by Shipments Affected</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Canadian Employment by Employment Affected</u>	<u>Percentage of Total Canadian Imports by Imports Affected</u>
1995	95	2.02	N/A	0.54
1996	94	2.06	N/A	0.48
1997	90	1.99	N/A	0.43
1998	76	1.74	N/A	0.33
1999	77	2.03	N/A	0.30
2000	78	2.17	N/A	0.37
2001	93	1.95	N/A	0.41
2002	89	1.81	N/A	0.36
2003	91	1.58	N/A	0.33
2004	80	1.78	N/A	0.30
2005	57	1.49	N/A	0.27
2006	38	1.37	N/A	0.19
2007	39	1.32	0.60	0.16
2008	39	1.62	0.67	0.20
2009	35	1.77	0.70	0.27
2010	31	2.43	0.97	0.31
2011	31	2.44	0.96	0.28

Source: Tribunal Research Branch Database and Statistics Canada

APPENDIX I – METHODOLOGY

This appendix addresses three methodological issues.

First, it sets out the approach used to calculate a base value of affected imports. It responds to the following question: What value of imports would have been expected in a base period just before the CBSA's PD? Please note that this methodology is also used to calculate the estimates of shipments and employment.

Second, it describes how the base value of the imports was adjusted to reflect the underlying growth (or decline) in the market for the years during which the measures were in place. It responds to the following question: If there had not been a finding of injurious dumping or subsidizing, what value of imports would have been expected for each of the years during which the finding or order was in place?

Finally, it explains the approach used to address certain special issues.

CALCULATION OF THE BASE LEVEL OF AFFECTED IMPORTS

Before estimating the level of imports affected by measures, it is necessary to know the level of imports that existed before measures were put in place. For the purposes of this analysis, the base level of imports is the average value of imports in the three calendar years prior to the PD.⁸

This approach to calculate a value for a base period provides a reasonably representative value of the affected imports. It reduces the impact of the period just prior to the PD when there is often a significant artificial increase or decrease in imports, depending on the reaction of the domestic industry to the dumped and/or subsidized imports. Taking a three-year average also moderates the potential volatility observed with some year-to-year changes in imports and likely captures a more "normal" pattern of import flows.

ESTIMATION OF IMPORTS AFFECTED FOR THE YEARS DURING WHICH MEASURES ARE IN PLACE

Once imports for a base period have been determined, the issue is how to estimate the level of affected imports for each year during which the anti-dumping and countervailing measures are in place.⁹ This is done by advancing the base level of affected imports, on an annual basis, to reflect the underlying growth (or decline) in the market.

-
8. Shipments were derived from sales from domestic production and imports were derived from the value of sales from imports. Depending on data availability, the average annual value of imports may be calculated on the basis of less than three years of import data. In other situations, it is necessary to estimate the value of imports by using the volume of imports and pertinent pricing information.
 9. For injury findings, imports are subject to duties starting on the date of the PD of dumping and/or subsidizing, 120 days before the issuance of a finding. Accordingly, imports during these 120 days were included for purposes of calculating affected imports in the first year of a finding.

FORWARD ESTIMATION

For each of the five years¹⁰ after the issuance of a finding or an order concerning a product, the value of affected imports was increased or decreased on the basis of an estimate of the market growth for that product.¹¹ For example, starting with the base level of imports, the level of imports was estimated for each year of a finding, including the first year, on the basis of the average annual change in the market value of the product in the three calendar years prior to the PD. An analogous approach was used for estimating the affected imports for each year of an order. The average annual change was based on the three calendar years prior to the order.

PDs are made throughout the year. As well, findings and orders expire or are rescinded throughout the year. Accordingly, the estimated value of affected imports was prorated, as appropriate, to account for situations where imports were affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures that cover only several months of a particular year.

In both situations, the value of imports affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures, estimated on an annual basis, was prorated by the number of months during which a measure was in place in a given year. For example, when a PD was made in July or when a finding or an order was rescinded in June, the value of estimated annual affected imports was reduced by 50 percent.

RETROACTIVE ADJUSTMENT

At the time of a review, the value of affected imports is recalculated and adjusted retroactively on the basis of the *actual* growth observed in the market. Information on the actual market growth becomes available at the time of the review.

Because this new information typically covers only the three calendar years prior to the start of a review, there is still a requirement to estimate the market for the two to three years following the previous finding or order. For example, an expiry review in 2005 of a finding made in 2000 will take into account annual market data for 2002, 2003 and 2004, leaving annual market data to be estimated for the “gap” years of 2000 and 2001.

The market data for the “gap” years were estimated on the basis of the average annual growth using the market value for the last full year prior to the PD and the market value for the first full year of the review. An analogous approach was used for estimating the “gap” years between two reviews.

Once the market data were estimated for the “gap” years, there would be an uninterrupted period for the five years during which the finding or order was in place. For this five-year period, the base value of the imports (for an injury finding) or the last annual import value (for an order) was revised each year by the year-over-year growth in the market. This value replaced the one estimated by forward estimation.

10. Anti-dumping and countervailing measures expire after five years. Towards the end of the five-year period, the CBSA and the Tribunal may conduct a review to determine if a continuation of the measures is warranted. The Tribunal collects market data, generally covering the preceding three years, only at the time of the initial inquiry and subsequent expiry reviews.

11. This approach assumes that the market share of imports remains constant. In reality, in markets where imports are fairly traded, the import share of the market over time may remain constant, increase or decrease.

SPECIAL ISSUES

Seasonal Application of Measures

In five cases, all covering agricultural products, there is a seasonal application of measures.

Product	Lineage	Period During Which Duties/Decision in Effect	Number of Months During Which Duties in Effect in a 12-month Period
Whole Potatoes	ADT-4-84	Throughout the year	12
	CIT-16-85	Throughout the year	12
	RR-89-010	Throughout the year	12
	RR-94-007	August 1-April 30	9
	RR-99-005	August 1-April 30	9
	RR-2004-006	August 1-April 30	9
	RR-2009-002	August 1-April 30	9
Fresh, Whole, Yellow Onions	CIT-1-87	August 16-March 31	7.5
	RR-91-004	August 16-March 31	7.5
	RR-96-005	Rescinded	0
Fresh Iceberg (Head) Lettuce	NQ-92-001	June 1-October 15	4.5
	RR-97-002	June 1-October 15	4.5
	RD-2001-002	Rescinded	0
Fresh, Whole, Delicious and Red Delicious Apples	NQ-94-001	October 1-June 30	9
	RR-99-001	Rescinded	0

For these cases, the affected imports are limited to the season in question. Since the base levels of imports were established for a 12-month period, the annual import data estimated for these products were discounted by the number of months, within a 12-month period, during which these measures were not in place.

For example, in Review No. RR-94-007 (*Whole Potatoes*), the Tribunal continued the findings, with an amendment to exclude imports during the period from May 1 to July 31, inclusive, of each calendar year. As a result, for purposes of estimating affected imports, starting with data for 1996, the values of estimated annual imports were discounted by 25 percent to reflect the impact of such an amendment.¹²

12. This methodology assumes that imports enter Canada regularly throughout the year. In reality, these imports may be seasonal in nature, coming into the country in larger quantities in certain months of the year.

Source Switching

When anti-dumping and countervailing measures are put in place against goods from certain countries, importers may start to import dumped and/or subsidized goods of the same kind from other countries, resulting in new cases and new findings in subsequent years.¹³ If these cases are treated as unique cases, the value of imports affected by anti-dumping and countervailing measures is likely to be overstated. Under this scenario, the first case appears to have provided only limited protection against dumped and/or subsidized imports, if the same value, or higher values, of dumped and/or subsidized imports continued to come into Canada, only from different sources. The following cases need to be considered as a group of cases.

Year of Finding/Order

Case	Inquiry	Review	Expiry
Photo Albums I ¹	Pre-1995: ADT-4-74	Pre-1995: R-3-84, 1995: RR-94-006	2000: LE-99-006
Photo Albums II	Pre-1995: CIT-18-84	1995: RR-94-006	2000: LE-99-006
Photo Albums III	Pre-1995: CIT-10-85	1995: RR-94-006	2000: LE-99-006
Photo Albums IV	Pre-1995: CIT-5-87	1995: RR-94-006	2000: LE-99-006
Photo Albums V	Pre-1995: NQ-90-003	Pre-1995: RR-89-012, 1995: RR-94-006	2000: LE-99-006
Rubber Footwear I	Pre-1995: ADT-4-79	1997: RR-97-001, 2002: RR-2001-005	2007: LE-2006-001
Rubber Footwear II	Pre-1995: ADT-2-82	1997: RR-97-001, 2002: RR-2001-005	2007: LE-2006-001
Carbon Steel Welded Pipe I	Pre-1995: ADT-6-83	1995: RR-94-004, 2000: RR-99-004	2004: RR-2004-003
Carbon Steel Welded Pipe II	Pre-1995: NQ-90-005	1996: RR-95-002, 2001: RR-2000-002	2006: LE-2005-003
Carbon Steel Welded Pipe III	Pre-1995: NQ-91-003	1996: RR-95-002, 2001: RR-2000-002	2006: LE-2005-003
Carbon Steel Plate I	Pre-1995: NQ-92-007	1999: RR-98-004 2003: RR-2001-006, 2008: RR-2007-001 2009: RR-2008-002	1998: RR-97-006
Carbon Steel Plate II	Pre-1995: NQ-93-004		2004: RR-2003-001
Carbon Steel Plate III ²	1997: NQ-97-001		2004: RR-2004-004
Carbon Steel Plate IV	2000: NQ-99-004		
Carbon Steel Plate V	2003: NQ-2003-002		
Carbon Steel Plate VI	2009: NQ-2009-003		
Cold-rolled Steel Sheet I	Pre-1995: NQ-92-009		1998: RR-97-007
Cold-rolled Steel Sheet II	1999: NQ-99-001		2004: RR-2003-004
Stainless Steel Round Bar I	1998: NQ-99-001	2003: RR-2002-003	2005: RD-2004-003 to RD-2004-007
Stainless Steel Round Bar II	1999: NQ-98-003	2003: RR-2002-004	2005: RD-2004-003 to RD-2004-007
Stainless Steel Round Bar III	2000: NQ-2000-002		2005: RD-2004-003 to RD-2004-007, LE-2004-008
Hot-rolled Steel Sheet I	1999: NQ-98-004	2006: RR-2005-002, 2010: RR-2010-001	2004: RR-2003-002
Hot-rolled Steel Sheet II	2001: NQ-2001-001		
Reinforcing Bar I	2000: NQ-99-002		2004: RR-2004-001
Reinforcing Bar II	2001: NQ-2000-007		2006: LE-2005-002

Note:

1. The cases on photo albums include self-adhesive leaves.
2. The review of Inquiry No. NQ-97-001 (Carbon Steel Plate III) in Review No. RR-2001-006 was delayed because of the safeguard inquiry into the importation of certain steel goods.

13. An example is the importation of carbon steel plate, with the filing of six separate complaints over the last 20 years, each typically involving different countries.

The imports in the first case in the group were estimated and revised, as set out above, for each year during which the finding was in place. As long as this finding was not rescinded, the annual imports were the point of reference for the annual imports of the other cases in the group. Thus, imports in the other cases, similarly escalated and revised, were added to the affected imports for the group, for a given year, only to the extent that they exceeded the corresponding imports of the first case in the group. When the first case in the group was rescinded, the imports of the second case became the reference point for the other cases in the group, and the process continued until the rescission of all orders in the group.

Temporal Switching

In Inquiry No. NQ-96-002 (*Fresh Garlic*), the Tribunal put in place anti-dumping measures that applied from July 1 to December 31, inclusive, of each calendar year. In response to this finding, importers started to import the goods in the first half of the year, the six-month period that fell outside the finding.

In the last full year (1995) before the finding, approximately 92 percent of the fresh garlic imported from China entered Canada in the second half of the year. After the finding, the pattern of imports reversed. In 1998, approximately 70 percent of the goods entered Canada in the first half of the year. By 2000, approximately 98 percent entered Canada in the first half of the year.

Coinciding with temporal switching, imports in each year during the period from 1998 to 2000, after the issuance of the finding in 1997, continued to increase and to maintain levels that were significantly higher than those of any year before the finding. This unabated growth in imports, along with a shift in the time of year during which imports entered Canada, strongly suggests that the 1997 finding had very little, if any, impact on the volume of imports.

Given the minimal effect of this finding on imports, it was decided to use actual import data collected for the second half of the year, in the first review (Expiry Review No. RR-2001-001), to estimate imports for 1998, 1999 and 2000, instead of using the methodology set out earlier. It was believed that these data would be more representative of the affected imports, given the temporal switching of imports since the 1997 injury finding.¹⁴

Significant Changes in Geographic Scope or Product Coverage

The Tribunal may exclude a country from a particular decision. In these situations, a country-specific measure is no longer in place, and Tribunal staff has removed, from the estimated values of affected imports, the estimated value for that country-specific measure.

14. A new finding was put in place (Inquiry No. NQ-2000-006) concerning imports from China that were entering Canada in the first half of the year. With the new finding, imports from China were affected irrespective of the time of year. The two findings were considered a single finding that covered the entire year, and imports for 2001 and thereafter were estimated using the usual methodology.

As well, a Tribunal decision may remove certain products from the measures applied in a particular case. In five cases, the Tribunal removed products that comprise a significant portion of the subject goods. In these situations, Tribunal staff removed, from the estimated values of affected imports, the estimated portion attributed to the removed product, according to its share in the base imports.

Case	Lineage	Exclusion/Decision
Canned Ham and Canned Pork-based Luncheon Meat	GIC-1-84	
	RR-89-003	
	RR-94-002	
	RR-99-002	Canned pork-based luncheon meat
	LE-2004-001	Rescinded
Women's Boots and Women's Shoes	NQ-89-003	
	RR-94-003	
	RR-99-003	Women's shoes
	RR-2004-002	Rescinded
Bicycles and Frames	NQ-92-002	Bicycles with selling price > \$325
	RR-97-003	
	RR-2002-001	Bicycles with retail price > \$400
	RR-2006-001	Bicycles with retail price > \$225 Bicycle frames rescinded
Corrosion-resistant Steel Sheet Products	NQ-93-007	Electro-galvanized steel for the automotive sector
	RR-98-007	Galvanized steel for the automotive sector
	RR-2003-003	Rescinded
Certain Fasteners	NQ-2004-005	
	RR-2009-001	Stainless steel fasteners
Waterproof Footwear and Bottoms	NQ-2000-004	Waterproof flocked-suede footwear
	RR-2004-008	
	RD-2009-003	Fishing waders made of polyester neoprene shells affixed to ethylene vinyl acetate boots with thermoplastic rubber outsoles
	LE-2009-004	Rescinded

A case in point is Inquiry No. NQ-89-003 (*Women's Boots and Women's Shoes*). In the second review (Review No. RR-99-003), the Tribunal continued the order concerning women's boots from China, but rescinded the part of the order concerning women's shoes from the same country. To remove the imports attributed to women's shoes that were no longer covered by the findings, starting on May 1, 2000, the estimated values of affected imports were discounted by 92 percent, the share accounted for by shoes in the base imports.

APPENDIX II - MEASURES AND FINDINGS

Table 3
Canadian Anti-dumping and Countervailing Measures
1995-2011

<u>Year</u>	<u>Measures</u>		<u>Findings/Orders</u>	
	<u>Added</u>	<u>Expired/Rescinded</u>	<u>In Place on December 21</u>	<u>In Place on December 21</u>
1995	7	5	95	40
1996	0	1	94	39
1997	7	11	90	38
1998	10	24	76	34
1999	9	8	77	35
2000	14	13	78	33
2001	19	4	93	35
2002	0	4	89	31
2003	5	3	91	32
2004	9	20	80	29
2005	4	27	57	21
2006	0	19	38	16
2007	3	2	39	15
2008	3	3	39	17
2009	2	6	35	17
2010	3	7	31	18
2011	1	1	31	19

Source: Tribunal Research Branch Database