COMMISSION IMPLEMENTING REGULATION (EU) 2025/1309

of 2 July 2025

imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and the Russian Federation following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council

THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION,

Having regard to the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union,

Having regard to Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2016 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Union ([1]) ('the basic Regulation'), and in particular Article 11(2) thereof,

Whereas:

1. PROCEDURE

1.1. Previous investigations and measures in force

1.1.1. *The Republic of Korea and Malaysia*

(1) By Regulation (EC) No 778/2003 ([2]) the Council imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in the Republic of Korea ('Korea') and Malaysia ('the original investigation'). Following a first expiry review of the anti-dumping measures pursuant to Article 11(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 384/96 of 22 December 1995 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community ([3]), the Council, by Implementing Regulation (EC) No 1001/2008 ([4]) re-imposed the anti-dumping measures. Following a second expiry review of the anti-dumping measures pursuant to Article 11(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community ([5]), the Commission, by Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1283/2014 ([6]) re-imposed the anti-dumping measures. Following a partial interim review in accordance with Article 11(3) of the basic Regulation, limited in scope to the examination of dumping as far as TK Corporation, a Korean exporting producer, was concerned, the Commission amended Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1283/2014 by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/306 ([7]). Following a third expiry review of the anti-dumping measures pursuant to Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation, the Commission, by Implementing Regulation (EU) No 2019/566 ([8]) of 9 April 2019 re-imposed the anti-dumping measures.

([1]) OJ L 176, 30.6.2016, p. 21, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2016/1036/oj.
([2]) Council Regulation (EC) No 778/2003 of 6 May 2003 amending Commission Decision No 283/2000/ECSC and Council Regulations (EC) No 584/96, (EC) No 763/2000 and (EC) No 1514/2002 with regard to the anti-dumping measures applicable to certain hot-rolled coils and to certain tube and pipe fittings, of iron or steel (OJ L 114, 8.5.2003, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2003/778/oj).
([3]) OJ L 56, 6.3.1996, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/1996/384/oj.
([4]) Council Regulation (EC) No 1001/2008 of 13 October 2008 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings, of iron or steel, originating in the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Regulation (EC) No 384/96 (OJ L 275, 16.10.2008, p. 18).
([5]) OJ L 343, 22.12.2009, p. 51, ELI: https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2009/1225/oj.
([6]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1283/2014 of 2 December 2014 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings, of iron or steel, originating in the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 (OJ L 347, 3.12.2014, p. 17, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2014/1283/oj).
([7]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/306 of 3 March 2016 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No 1283/2014 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings, of iron or steel, originating in the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an interim review pursuant to Article 11(3) of Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 (OJ L 58, 4.3.2016, p. 38, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2016/306/oj).
([8]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/566 of 9 April 2019 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in the Russian Federation, the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council and terminating the investigation concerning the imports of the same product originating in the Republic of Turkey (OJ L 99, 10.4.2019, p. 9, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2019/566/oj).

(2) The anti-dumping measures currently in force on the imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in Korea took the form of an *ad valorem* duty rate, which was set at the level of the dumping margin of 32,4 % for imports from an individually named exporter (TK Corporation), with a residual duty rate of 44,0 % set at the level of the injury margin.

(3) The anti-dumping measures currently in force on the imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in Malaysia took the form of an *ad valorem* duty rate, which was set at the level of the dumping margin of 49,9 % and 59,2 % for imports from individually named exporters, with a residual duty rate of 75,0 %.

1.1.2. *The Russian Federation*

(4) The Council, by Implementing Regulation (EU) No 78/2013 ([9]) imposed a definitive anti-dumping duty against imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in the Republic of Türkiye' ('Türkiye') and the Russian Federation ('Russia'). Following a first expiry review, the Commission by Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/566 of 9 April 2019 re-imposed anti-dumping duty on imports originating in Russia and terminated the investigation concerning the imports of the same product originating in Türkiye.

(5) The anti-dumping measures currently in force with respect to Russia took the form of an *ad valorem* residual duty rate set at the level of the dumping margin of 23,8 %.

1.1.3. *Other third countries not subject to this review*

(6) Anti-dumping measures are currently in force on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in the People's Republic of China ('China'), which have been extended to Taiwan, Indonesia, Sri Lanka and the Philippines ([10]).

1.2. **Request for an expiry review**

(7) Following the publication of a notice of impending expiry ([11]) the European Commission ('the Commission') received a request for a review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation.

(8) The request for review ('the request') was submitted on 11 January 2024 by the Defence Committee of the steel butt-welding fittings industry of the European Union ('the applicant') on behalf of the Union industry of certain tube and pipe fittings in the sense of Article 5(4) of the basic Regulation. The request was based on the grounds that the expiry of the measures would be likely to result in recurrence of dumping and injury to the Union industry.

1.3. **Initiation of an expiry review**

(9) Having determined, after consulting the Committee established by Article 15(1) of the basic Regulation, that sufficient evidence existed for the initiation of an expiry review, on 9 April 2024 the Commission initiated an expiry review regarding imports into the Union of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in Korea, Malaysia and Russia ('the countries concerned') based on Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation. It published a Notice of Initiation in the *Official Journal of the European Union* ([12]) ('the Notice of Initiation').

([9]) Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 78/2013 of 17 January 2013 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings of iron or steel originating in Russia and Turkey (OJ L 27, 29.1.2013, p. 1, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2013/78/oj).

([10]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1934 of 27 October 2015 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings, of iron or steel, originating in the People's Republic of China following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 (OJ L 282, 28.10.2015, p. 14, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg_impl/2015/1934/oj).

([11]) OJ C 246, 13.7.2023, p. 9.

([12]) Notice of initiation of an expiry review of the anti-dumping measures applicable to imports of certain tubes and pipes fittings, originating in the Federation of Russia, the Republic of Korea and Malaysia (OJ C/2024/2500, 9.4.2024).

1.4. Review investigation period and period considered

(10) The investigation of continuation or recurrence of dumping covered the period from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2024 ('review investigation period'). The examination of trends relevant for the assessment of the likelihood of a continuation or recurrence of injury covered the period from 1 January 2020 to the end of the review investigation period ('the period considered').

1.5. Interested parties

(11) In the Notice of Initiation, interested parties were invited to contact the Commission in order to participate in the investigation. In addition, the Commission specifically informed the applicant, other known Union producers, the known producers in the three countries concerned, the authorities of Korea, Malaysia and Russia, known importers, users as well as associations known to be concerned about the initiation of the expiry review and invited them to participate.

(12) Interested parties had an opportunity to comment on the initiation of the expiry review and to request a hearing with the Commission and/or the Hearing Officer in trade proceedings.

1.6. Comments on initiation

(13) Following initiation, the government of Russia provided comments on dumping and injury aspects of the review request, as well as the non-compliance with Article 11.3 of the WTO Antidumping Agreement ('ADA').

(14) The government of Russia argued that the expiry review lacks justification, as the Union's import ban on Russian tube and pipe fittings prevents any market re-entry regardless of the anti-dumping measures. The Commission however recalls that the purpose of an expiry review is to assess the likelihood of recurrence or continuation of dumping and injury *should the measures lapse*, irrespective of temporary geopolitical measures such as sanctions. Indeed, the existence of sanctions does not preclude the legal obligation to conduct a review under the applicable trade defence framework.

(15) Moreover, the government of Russia claimed that the likelihood analysis of recurrence is based on unverifiable private data that are contradicted by publicly available trade statistics showing higher export prices. It should be noted that at the time of preparation of the review request Russia had not published its official customs statistics since the end of 2021. Consequently, Russian export data was no longer available through UN Comtrade or the WTO ITC, and the Russian Customs Administration's website did not allow access to these statistics. As a result, the applicant had to rely on private market intelligence to obtain export sales information in the review investigation period ('RIP').

(16) The government of Russia also indicated that the constructed normal value relied on questionable input costs and on a non-transparent methodology, undermining the credibility of the dumping analysis. The Commission wishes to point out that, in accordance with Article 2(3) of the basic Regulation, the Commission used undistorted costs of production and reliable third-country data in light of market distortions in Russia and that this methodology is consistent with the established practice.

(17) In addition, the government of Russia claimed, in contrast with the review request's assertion of a stable future Russian domestic market for tube and pipe fittings, that official data demonstrates substantial expansion possibilities for Russian tube and pipe fittings on the domestic market. The Russian government provided references to certain studies which should prove such expansion possibilities. However, the references did not allow the Commission to trace these documents to its source or to any other public information on this topic. To the contrary, a simple internet search revealed that for example the Russian pipe market faces significant difficulties due to recent developments in the energy sector and market trends ([13]).

([13]) See e.g. https://www.steelradar.com/en/russian-pipe-market-faces-uncertainty-amid-challenges/ (last accessed 27 March 2025).

(18) The government of Russia also claimed that the initiation of the expiry review was against WTO rules, and in particular Article 11.1 of the ADA, since the sanctions currently in place against Russia following the military aggression of Russia against Ukraine have effectively halted all imports of Russian tube and pipe fittings into the Union. However, as set out in recital 14 and 81, the current situation cannot be considered of a lasting nature. The existing sanctions cannot therefore have a bearing on the initiation of the investigation, nor on its conclusions.

(19) In view of the above, the Commission rejected the claims on initiation by the government of Russia.

1.7. **Sampling**

(20) In the Notice of Initiation, the Commission stated that it might sample the interested parties in accordance with Article 17 of the basic Regulation.

Sampling of Union producers

(21) In the Notice of Initiation, the Commission stated that it had provisionally selected a sample of Union producers. The Commission selected the sample on the basis of production volume and sales in 2023 of the product under review. This sample consisted of three Union producers. The sampled Union producers accounted for more than 50 % of the estimated total Union production and sales volumes. In accordance with Article 17(2) of the basic Regulation, the Commission invited interested parties to comment on the provisional sample. No comments were received. The sample is representative of the Union industry.

Sampling of importers

(22) To decide whether sampling was necessary and, if so, to select a sample, the Commission asked unrelated importers to provide the information specified in the Notice of Initiation. No unrelated importers provided the requested information and agreed to be included in the sample.

Sampling of exporting producers in the countries concerned

(23) To decide whether sampling was necessary and, if so, to select a sample, the Commission asked all known producers in the countries concerned to provide the information specified in the Notice of Initiation. In addition, the Commission asked the missions of the countries concerned to the European Union to identify and/or contact other producers, if any, that could be interested in participating in the investigation.

(24) No exporting producers in the countries concerned provided the requested information and agreed to be included in the sample.

1.8. **Replies to the questionnaire**

(25) The Commission sent questionnaires to the sampled Union producers and the applicant. The same questionnaires had also been made available online ([14]) on the day of initiation.

1.9. **Verification**

(26) The Commission sought and verified all the information deemed necessary for the determination of likelihood of continuation or recurrence of dumping and injury and of the Union interest. Verification visits pursuant to Article 16 of the basic Regulation were carried out at the premises of the following companies:

([14]) https://tron.trade.ec.europa.eu/investigations/case-view?caseId=2722.

Union producers

— Virgilio CENA & Figli S.p.A., Italy

— ERNE Fittings GmbH, Austria

— INTERFIT S.A., France

1.10. Subsequent procedure

(27) On 6 May 2025, the Commission disclosed the essential facts and considerations on the basis of which it intended to maintain the anti-dumping duties in force. All parties were granted a period within which they could make comments on the disclosure.

(28) The comments made by interested parties were considered by the Commission and taken into account, where appropriate.

2. PRODUCT UNDER REVIEW, PRODUCT CONCERNED AND LIKE PRODUCT

2.1. Product under review

(29) The product under review is the same as in the original investigation and previous expiry reviews, namely tube or pipe fittings (other than cast fittings, flanges and threaded fittings), of iron or steel (not including stainless steel), with a greatest external diameter not exceeding 609,6 mm, of a kind used for butt-welding or other purposes, currently falling within CN codes ex 7307 93 11, ex 7307 93 19 and ex 7307 99 80 (TARIC codes 7307 93 11 91, 7307 93 11 93, 7307 93 11 94, 7307 93 11 95, 7307 93 11 99, 7307 93 19 91, 7307 93 19 93, 7307 93 19 94, 7307 93 19 95, 7307 93 19 99, 7307 99 80 92, 7307 99 80 93, 7307 99 80 94, 7307 99 80 95 and 7307 99 80 98) ('TPF' or 'the product under review').

2.2. Product concerned

(30) The product concerned by this investigation is the product under review originating in the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and the Russian Federation, and currently falling under CN codes ex 7307 93 11, ex 7307 93 19 and ex 7307 99 80 (TARIC codes 7307 93 11 91, 7307 93 11 93, 7307 93 11 94, 7307 93 11 95, 7307 93 11 99, 7307 93 19 91, 7307 93 19 93, 7307 93 19 94, 7307 93 19 95, 7307 93 19 99, 7307 99 80 92, 7307 99 80 93, 7307 99 80 94, 7307 99 80 95 and 7307 99 80 98).

2.3. Like product

(31) As established in the original investigation and in the previous expiry reviews, this expiry review investigation confirmed that the following products have the same basic physical and technical characteristics as well as the same basic uses:

— the product concerned when exported to the Union;

— the product under review produced and sold on the domestic market of the countries concerned;

— the product under review produced and sold by the exporting producers to the rest of the world; and

— the product under review produced and sold in the Union by the Union industry.

(32) These products are therefore considered to be like products within the meaning of Article 1(4) of the basic Regulation.

3. DUMPING

3.1. Preliminary remarks

(33) As mentioned in recital 19, none of the producers in Korea, Malaysia and Russia cooperated in the investigation.

(34) The Commission informed the authorities of all countries concerned that, due to the absence of cooperation, the Commission might apply Article 18 of the basic Regulation concerning the findings with regard to Korea, Malaysia and Russia. The Commission did not receive any comments or requests for an intervention of the Hearing Officer from the authorities of the three countries in this regard.

(35) Consequently, in accordance with Article 18(1) of the basic Regulation, the findings in relation to the likelihood of recurrence of dumping were based on facts available, in particular, publicly available information such as official company websites, information in the request for review, and information obtained from cooperating parties in the course of the review investigation (namely, the applicant and the sampled Union producers). The Commission also used various import statistics, including import statistics collected in Global Trade Atlas ('GTA') ([15]), and the United States of America ('US') import database.

3.2. Republic of Korea

(36) No Korean producer cooperated during the investigation. Therefore, the Commission relied on facts available, in line with Article 18 of the basic Regulation. This included information provided by the applicant in their review request, supplemented with available statistical data for the review investigation period, such as GTA and US import statistics.

3.2.1. *Exports to the Union*

(37) Exports from Korea to the Union were very low (around 60 tonnes) during the review investigation period and were therefore not considered representative. The analysis focused on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping from Korea based on facts available, in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation.

3.2.2. *Likelihood of recurrence of dumping*

(38) The Commission analysed whether there was a likelihood of recurrence of dumping should the measures lapse. When doing so, the following elements were analysed: Korean export prices to third countries, the production capacity and spare capacity in Korea and the attractiveness of the Union market.

3.2.2.1. Korean export prices to third countries

(39) To assess the likely export behaviour of Korean TPF producers in the Union market in the absence of measures, the Commission analysed exports to the US. The US market was selected as the appropriate reference market on the basis that, unlike other Korean export destinations, it is comparable in scale to the Union market, characterized by a strong domestic industry, a substantial volume of imports, and relatively low import tariffs, thereby constituting a highly competitive market. Furthermore, the US represents Korea's main export destination, accounting for approximately 32 % of its total TPF exports during the review investigation period ([16]). This methodology aligns with the approach used in the previous expiry review for Korea, as referenced in recital 1.

([15]) https://connect.ihsmarkit.com/gta/home/.

([16]) The other main destinations during the review investigation period were Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Indonesia and Türkiye, representing respectively 23, 12 %, 7 %, 3 % and 2 % of Korean TPF exports.

(40) In the absence of any other available information and in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation, the normal value was determined based on the data provided by the applicant in the review request. To establish this value for TPF in Korea during the RIP, the applicant relied on price data from a major Korean producer of TPF. The price list, valid as of December 2023, was expressed in KRW on an FCA Busan basis and converted to Euros using the average spot exchange rate published by the European Commission ([17]).

(41) To ensure representativeness, the applicant classified product types into size categories and applied weighing factors based on their market relevance. Finally, for comparability with export prices, the applicant determined the normal value in Korea, expressed in value per weight.

(42) Export prices during the review investigation period were determined using publicly available data, specifically US customs statistics ([18]). No adjustments for the level of trade were necessary, as the FOB export price was deemed comparable the normal value determined on an FCA basis.

(43) To express the price difference as a percentage of the import price at CIF level in the third country, the applicant had to assess the costs of insurance and international freight from Korea to its main export markets. This was done based on the OECD database, international transport and insurance costs of merchandise trade (ITIC) ([19]).

(44) The normal value was then compared with the export price as established above, in accordance with Article 2(11) of the basic Regulation.

(45) The price difference found, expressed as a percentage of the CIF US frontier price, amounted to 21 %.

3.2.2.2. Production capacity and spare capacity

(46) According to the facts available in the request for review, the Korean TPF industry is highly developed, with at least seven manufacturers, including two major producers —Tae Kwang Bend Co. (TK Bend) and Sung Kwang Bend Co. (SK Bend) — which have a combined production capacity of over 260 000 tonnes. Notably, SK Bend has doubled its capacity since the last expiry review in 2019, while two other producers have ceased operations.

(47) Overall, Korea's total estimated production capacity for TPF has grown from 160 000 tonnes in 2019 to approximately 283 000 tonnes during the RIP. To account for potential overlap in product categories, a conservative estimate of 250 000 tonnes was used.

(48) According to the same source, Korea has a significant spare capacity, with a low utilization rate of 23 %. During the RIP, domestic consumption was estimated at 16 500 tonnes, while total production amounted to 58 200 tonnes, primarily for export. This has resulted in a substantial overcapacity of 191 800 tonnes. This excess capacity is nearly four times the total Union consumption, which was estimated to ca. 48 000 tonnes in the RIP.

(49) Furthermore, none of the facts available point to a substantial growth or decline of sectors that use TPF in Korea and, hence, the Korean domestic market consumption for TPF is considered to remain rather stable for the years ahead and will therefore not offer any substantial expansion possibilities for the Korean TPF producers. Besides the US, the main other export markets for Korean TPF producers are the Middle East and South-East Asia. No information available during the investigation suggests that the demand on any of those markets would increase to a significant extent in the coming years. Besides, the rising competition from China could limit the growth potential of Korean TPF exports in key regions, potentially pushing them to seek new export opportunities in markets like the European Union if existing trade measures are lifted.

([17]) InforEuro, the exchange rate of the Euro currency.
([18]) Data are compiled and published by the US Census Bureau, Economic Indicators Division, http://www.census.gov/foreign-trade/guide/index.html.
([19]) OECD (2024), 'International transport and insurance costs of merchandise trade – OECD', International Trade by Commodity Statistics (database), https://doi.org/10.1787/9c638cb6-en (accessed on 19 July 2024).

3.2.2.3. Attractiveness of the Union market

(50) The Union market remains a very attractive market for Korean exporting producers, both in terms of volume, as one of the largest markets worldwide, and in terms of prices. Indeed, the average price on the Union market as assessed in recital 122 was 19 % higher than the average price Korea exported TPF to the United States of America (US) during the RIP, as reported in the US import database. The Union market remains therefore an attractive export market for Korean TPF.

3.2.3. *Conclusion on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping*

(51) Given Korea's substantial spare capacity, the low-price levels of Korean TPF exported to third countries during the review investigation period, and the attractiveness of the Union market as a key potential export destination, it is highly likely that significant quantities of TPF from Korea would enter the Union market at dumped prices if the current measures were to expire. Therefore, the Commission concluded that there is likelihood of recurrence of dumping should the measures lapse.

3.3. **Malaysia**

(52) No Malaysian producer cooperated during the investigation. The Commission used facts available in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation. i.e. the information provided by the applicant in the review request, updated with available statistical data for the RIP, including Global trade Atlas (GTA) export data.

3.3.1. *Exports to the Union*

(53) According to Comext database, imports from Malaysia to the Union were negligible (less than 1 tonne) during the review investigation period and were therefore not considered representative. The analysis focused on the recurrence of dumping from Malaysia based on facts available, in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation.

3.3.2. *Likelihood of recurrence of dumping*

(54) The Commission analysed whether there was a likelihood of recurrence of dumping should the measures lapse. When doing so, the following elements were analysed: Malaysian export prices to third countries, the production capacity and spare capacity in Malaysia, and the attractiveness of the Union market.

3.3.2.1. Malaysian export prices to third countries

(55) In order to examine the likely behaviour of TPF producers in Malaysia, the Commission examined Malaysia's exports to the US. This approach is identical to the one applied in the previous expiry review for Malaysia mentioned in recital 1. The Commission chose the US, as it is a market of a similar size to that of the Union, with many domestic producers but also with a large proportion of imports, making it a very competitive market. Furthermore, the US market is by far the most important export market for Malaysia. According to GTA export statistics, the export volume to the US was ca. 19 000 tonnes in the review investigation period, representing 72 % of Malaysia's total TPF exports during that period.

(56) In the absence of any other information available and in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation, normal value was based on data provided by the applicant in the request for review. The applicant could not find price data for TPF in Malaysia, as such information is not publicly available. Instead, a normal value was constructed based on the Union industry's factors of production, using publicly available Malaysian cost data for raw materials, energy, utilities, labour, and other manufacturing costs.

(57) Key cost components were sourced from Malaysian government statistics ([20]) and other global statistics ([21]) ([22]) while indirect costs were estimated using Union industry benchmarks. Selling, general, and administrative expenses, as well as profit margins, were based on financial statements from a major Malaysian TPF producer, Pantech Steel Industries.

(58) Export prices during the review investigation period were established based on publicly available data, i.e. GTA. Based on the methodology developed by the applicant in the request for review, in view of a better comparability, the Commission adjusted the statistics based on the latest data available in the OECD data base on CIF/FOB margins.

(59) On the above basis, normal value was compared with export price of TPF to the US, in accordance with Article 2(11) of the basic Regulation. Overall, Malaysian exports to the US market show a significant price difference of over 73 %.

3.3.2.2. Production capacity and spare capacity

(60) According to the request, five Malaysian manufacturers of TPF have been identified by the applicant. Together these producers have a combined estimated production capacity of 57 000 tonnes per year. Anggerik Laksana has the highest capacity at 24 000 tonnes annually, followed by Pantech Steel Industries with 21 000 tonnes. The remaining three producers — Arah Dagang, Jaks Steel Industries, and ML Pipe Fittings — are each estimated at 4 000 tonnes per year.

(61) Malaysia's domestic consumption is estimated at 12 000 tonnes annually, while exports during the RIP (April–September 2023) were around 21 800 tonnes and imports at 10 400 tonnes. This suggests domestic production of about 23 400 tonnes, leaving a spare capacity of 33 600 tonnes — over 70 % of the EU's estimated consumption of ca. 48 000 tonnes in the RIP.

(62) In conclusion, Malaysia's production capacity significantly exceeds its domestic demand, with a substantial share directed towards exports. This imbalance suggests that the removal of anti-dumping measures could result in increased export volumes to the EU.

3.3.2.3. Attractiveness of the Union market

(63) From April to September 2023, Malaysian export prices to the US and to all destinations were found to be 62 % and 56 % cheaper respectively than the prices of TPF in the EU. Even with freight costs factored in, Malaysian prices would remain significantly below Union price levels, so that the Union market is also attractive in terms of prices. Given Malaysia's large spare capacity and the global oversupply, repealing the anti-dumping measures is likely to lead to a substantial increase in Malaysian exports to the Union at dumped prices.

(64) Moreover, on 25 July 2018, the US authorities extended the anti-dumping duty of 182,9 % imposed on imports of carbon steel butt-weld pipe fittings from China provisionally to imports of that product from Malaysia following an anti-circumvention investigation ([23]). In March 2023, the US International Trade Commission (USITC) determined that revoking the existing anti-dumping duty orders on stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings from Malaysia would likely lead to the continuation or recurrence of material injury to US industry. As a result, Malaysian exporting producers would need to look for alternative markets to export TPF.

([20]) https://www.dosm.gov.my/
([21]) Malaysia energy prices | GlobalPetrolPrices.com.
([22])
— Energy Commission - Gas Prices and Tariffs
— SPAN Water and Sewerage Handbook 2023 published by the National Water Services Commission (SPAN) of Malaysia-- https://www.scribd.com/document/824193558/SPAN-Water-and-Sewerage-Hand-Book.
([23]) 83 FR 35205 - Carbon Steel Butt-Weld Pipe Fittings From the People's Republic of China: Preliminary Affirmative Determination of Circumvention of the Antidumping Duty Order - Content Details - 2018-15882.

(65) The above, makes the Union market a target market for the Malaysian overcapacities and products previously sold to the US, should the measures be allowed to lapse.

3.3.3. *Conclusion on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping*

(66) Considering the spare capacity, the pricing practices in the US and the anti-dumping duties extended to Malaysia in that market, paired with the attractiveness of the Union market for Malaysian TPF producers, it is highly likely that Malaysian TPF producers would export significant quantities of TPF at dumped prices to the Union, should the measures be allowed to lapse. Therefore, the Commission concluded that there is likelihood of recurrence of dumping should the measures lapse.

3.4. **Russian Federation**

(67) Given to the lack of cooperation from the Russian producers, the Commission relied on facts available, in line with Article 18 of the basic Regulation. i.e. the information provided by the applicant in the review request.

3.4.1. *Exports to the Union*

(68) According to Comext database, imports from Russia were non-existent during the review investigation period. Therefore, the Commission's analysis focused on the recurrence of dumping.

(69) Since the end of 2021, official customs statistics published by the Russian authorities have not been available, either directly or through databases such as UN Comtrade or the WTO ITC. Therefore, to assess export sales to third countries during the review investigation period (RIP), the Commission relied on data provided by the applicant in the review request, which was sourced from private market intelligence available through Tradedata.pro ([24]).

3.4.2. *Likelihood analysis of recurrence of dumping*

(70) The Commission analysed whether there was a likelihood of recurrence of dumping should the measures lapse. When doing so, the following elements were analysed: Russian export prices to third countries, the production capacity and spare capacity in Russia, and the attractiveness of the Union market.

3.4.2.1. Russian export prices to third countries

(71) In the absence of any other information available, normal value was based on data provided by the applicant in the request for review, in accordance with Article 18 of the basic Regulation.

(72) Domestic price data in Russia were not publicly available, as a result, the applicant resorted to constructing a normal value based on the costs of production in Russia. The methodology involved applying the factors of production from representative Union producers and combining them with Russian cost data. The raw materials, including the 'mother pipe' (seamless steel pipes), were priced using import statistics from private market intelligence, with data covering the period from March to October 2023. Other costs, such as energy and utilities, were based on publicly available price information for electricity, natural gas, and water in Russia. For labour costs, the applicant used data from Trading Economics and the OECD. Selling, general, and administrative expenses (SG&A), along with profit margins, were incorporated into the constructed normal value using financial data from a Russian TPF producer, BAZ 'Blagovesschensky Fittings Plant' JSC.

(73) Export prices during the review investigation period were established based on private market intelligence provider ([25]). Only two export markets are of significance for Russian TPF producers: Uzbekistan (1 282 t) and Armenia (216 t). These countries represent 85 % and 14 % of total Russian exports respectively.

([24]) www.tradedata.pro.
([25]) Tradedata.pro.

(74) The normal value was then compared with the export price for these two countries, in accordance with Article 2(11) of the basic Regulation.

(75) The price difference was then calculated as a percentage of the Russian export price to each of these two countries respectively. On that basis the price difference percentage amounted to 29,6 % for Uzbekistan and 65,9 % for Armenia. By considering all destinations, the weighed price difference percentage during the RIP amounted to 25,1 %.

3.4.2.2. Production capacity and spare capacity

(76) According to facts available, 14 Russian exporters of the product under review have been identified, including 13 exporting producers. The capacity of these producers has been estimated as follows: JSC Lisky at 26 000 tonnes, OMK Group Trubodetal at 30 000 tonnes, BAZ at 10 000 tonnes, and 10 other producers at 2 400 tonnes each, totalling 90 000 tonnes. The capacity of the less known producers is conservatively estimated to be lower than the average size of small Union producers.

(77) To estimate spare capacity, applicant assumed a capacity utilization rate of 40 % in Russia, which results in a spare capacity of 54 000 tonnes, exceeding the consumption of TPF in the EU which is estimated at 48 000 tonnes.

3.4.2.3. Attractiveness of the Union market

(78) The Commission found that during the review investigation period, Russian producers exported the product under review to third markets at prices approximately 44 % lower than the average sales prices of Union producers on the Union market, suggesting that exporting to the Union may be more attractive for Russian exporters than exporting to other countries.

(79) Moreover, the Union market is one of the largest markets globally and an attractive export destination due to its geographical proximity, size, and substantial consumption during the review investigation period.

(80) Besides Russia, the main export markets for these industries are Kazakhstan and Belarus. No information is available suggesting that the demand on any of those markets would shrink or increase to a significant extent in the coming years. According to the information provided by the applicant, there is a worldwide overcapacity of TPF, and the Union market is one of the largest markets worldwide and therefore an attractive export destination.

(81) The Commission acknowledges that due to the existing sanctions, this diversion may not take place. However, as these sanctions are linked to the military aggression of Russia against Ukraine and the underlying geopolitical situation, their scope, modulation and duration are not predictable. Moreover, anti-dumping measures have a lifetime of five years. Considering these uncertainties and that the Council may amend the precise scope and duration of sanctions at any moment, the Commission found that the existence of current sanctions cannot have a bearing on a prospective exercise such as the review of antidumping measures, and cannot then alter the conclusions of the Commission in this proceeding.

3.4.3. *Conclusion on the likelihood of recurrence of dumping*

(82) The Commission established a likelihood of recurrence of dumping based on the following elements. First, the Commission established that Russian producers exported TPF to third countries at prices lower than the normal value. Also, the production capacity and spare capacity in Russia was significant in the review investigation period with spare capacity exceeding the total Union consumption. Moreover, the attractiveness of the Union market in terms of size, geographical proximity and prices make it likely that Russian exports and spare capacity would be redirected to the Union market should the measures expire.

(83) The Commission considered that the impact of sanctions is a temporary situation and may change at any time. Therefore, sanctions cannot have a bearing on the conclusions in this proceeding.

(84) In light of the foregoing, based on facts available the Commission concluded that the expiry of the anti-dumping measures on TPF from Russia would be likely to lead to a recurrence of dumping.

(85) Following disclosure, the Government of Russia argued that the sanctions were hindering the imports from Russia to resume for an unpredictable period of time, whereby Russian imports would not resume should the measures be removed. It also argued that the Commission contradicted itself by claiming that the diversion of TPF from Russia may not take place.

(86) The Government of Russia also argued that the source of information used by the Commission to determine the export price was non verifiable and non-transparent as it relied on private market intelligence through Tradedata.pro. The Government of Russia also indicated that UN Comtrade statistics are publicly available for imports from Russia both to Armenia and Uzbekistan.

(87) The Government of Russia also noted that world markets are relatively open for trade in TPF.

(88) As explained in recital 83, the Commission considered that, as the scope and duration of sanctions are unpredictable, their existence cannot have a bearing on a prospective exercise such as the review of antidumping measures, and cannot then alter the conclusions of the Commission in this proceeding. The Commission also noted that the Government of Russia did not provide statistics based on UN Comtrade or demonstrated that such data would lead to a different conclusion than the one established based on Tradedata.pro, which is a data source available upon payment. The claim related to the openness of the world market was considered pointless and inconclusive, also in view of the attractiveness of the Union market. On this basis, the Commission rejected these claims.

3.5. Conclusion

(89) The Commission concluded that given the export pricing practices of the countries concerned, the important overcapacities in the countries concerned, and the attractiveness of the Union market for the TPF producers in these countries, imports of the product under review from these countries to the Union would increase significantly if anti-dumping measures were allowed to lapse. The Commission found in addition that those imports would likely be made at dumped prices. The Commission therefore concluded that the expiry of the measures on TPF would be likely to lead to recurrence of dumping with respect to Korea, Malaysia and Russia.

4. INJURY

4.1. Definition of the Union industry and Union production

(90) During the review investigation period, the like product was manufactured by 22 producers in the Union. They constitute the 'Union industry' within the meaning of Article 4(1) of the basic Regulation.

(91) The total Union production in the review investigation period was established at 24 368 tonnes. This number was established on the basis of available information concerning the Union industry, such as the request, information provided by the applicant and verified questionnaire replies of the sampled Union producers. As indicated in recital 21, three Union producers were selected in the sample representing more than 50 % of the total Union production and sales of the like product.

4.2. Union consumption

(92) The Commission established the Union consumption on the basis of Eurostat import statistics and sales volumes of the Union industry in the Union, as submitted by the applicant and cross-checked with the verified data from the sampled Union producers.

(93) Union consumption developed as follows:

Table 1

Union consumption (tonnes)

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Total Union Consumption (tonnes)	47 270	46 150	49 474	48 856	47 892
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*98*	*105*	*103*	*101*

Source: Eurostat, applicant and sampled Union producers.

(94) Union consumption remained stable throughout the period considered. Since TPF is used mainly in the petrochemical industry, construction, energy generation and industrial installations to connect tubes or pipes, the demand for TPF is generally coupled with the activity in the energy infrastructure sector. However, the COVID-19 pandemic, the invasion of Ukraine by Russia and the subsequent energy crisis has led to a stagnation in the decision-making concerning the choice of sustainable energy sources. This has meant that planned and on-going long-term projects concerning the energy transition have largely been put on hold for the time being. As a result, Union consumption has remained stable during the past years. The expectation is that consumption will increase, once governments and energy companies have decided on the type of sustainable energy to which the transition from fossil fuels will be made (e.g. wind, solar, nuclear or other energies).

4.3. Imports from the countries concerned

4.3.1. *Volume and market share of the imports from the countries concerned*

(95) The Commission established the volume of imports on the basis of Eurostat data and the information submitted by the applicant. The market share of the imports was then established on the basis of Union consumption as shown in Table 1.

(96) Imports into the Union from the countries concerned developed as follows:

Table 2

Import volume (tonnes) and market share

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Volume of imports from Korea	80	10	38	62	78
Market share Korea	0,2 %	0,0 %	0,1 %	0,1 %	0,2 %
Volume of imports from Malaysia	2	2	1	9	1
Market share Malaysia	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Volume of imports from Russia	122	3	23	-	-

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Market share Russia	0,3 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %	0,0 %
Volume of imports from the countries concerned	204	15	62	71	79
Market share of the countries concerned	0,4 %	0,0 %	0,1 %	0,1 %	0,2 %
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*7*	*29*	*35*	*38*

Source: Eurostat and the applicant.

(97) Imports from all three countries concerned were negligible or non-existent throughout the period concerned. For Korea and Malaysia these levels are similar to those seen since the imposition of the original definitive measures in 2002. With regard to Russia, imports – which were already at very low levels before the period concerned – have dropped to zero since the sanctions on Russia were put in place following the military aggression of Russia against Ukraine.

4.3.2. *Prices of the imports from the countries concerned and price undercutting*

(98) In view of the very low or even inexistent import volumes from the countries concerned and the wide range of product types (comprising variety of parameters such as specification standards, material grade, basic raw material, type (elbow, tee or reducer), external diameter and wall thickness) of the product under review, prices of these imports could not be analysed meaningfully.

(99) Since there was no cooperation from exporting producers in any of the countries concerned, and in view of the very low quantities imported in the Union from these countries, the Commission determined a price comparison with prices on the Union market during the review investigation period by comparing:

(1) the weighted average sales prices of the product under review of the sampled Union producers charged to unrelated customers on the Union market, adjusted to an ex-works level; and

(2) the corresponding weighted average prices of the product under review from the countries concerned sold to:

(a) for Korea and Malaysia: to the United States of America ('US'), as explained in recitals 39 and 55 and in line with the methodology used in the previous investigations, excluding anti-dumping duties for such imports into the US. Prices were established on a cost, insurance, freight (CIF) basis ([26]), with appropriate adjustments for post-importation costs and Union anti-dumping duties. In the absence of any other information, post-importation costs were estimated at 1 % of the CIF value ([27]).

([26]) Based on information provided by the applicant, obtained from https://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=CIF_FOB_ITIC.

([27]) See also recital 128 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/566 of 9 April 2019 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in the Russian Federation, the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council and terminating the investigation concerning the imports of the same product originating in the Republic of Turkey (OJ L 99, 10.4.2019, p. 9).

(b) For Russia: to Uzbekistan and Armenia, in line with what was explained in recital 73 and established on a cost, insurance, freight (CIF) basis, with appropriate adjustments for post-importation costs and Union anti-dumping duties. In the absence of any other information, post-importation costs were estimated at 1 % of the CIF value ([28]).

(100) The result of the comparison was expressed as a percentage of the sampled Union producers' turnover during the review investigation period. It showed a weighted average price difference ranging from 30,4 % to 40,1 % for Malaysia and a price difference of 31,7 % for Russia. On the other hand, Korean prices were 18,8 % to 29,9 % higher than prices on the Union market after the application of the anti-dumping duties.

(101) After disclosure the government of Russia argued that the choice of Armenia and Uzbekistan as explained in recital 99(2)(b) makes no sense economically as these markets are distinct from the Union market in terms of product mix and other parameters. However, the government of Russia did not provide any supporting evidence for its claim, nor did it propose a more appropriate source or methodology for the price comparison in recital 99. In addition, Armenia and Uzbekistan together account for almost 100 % of Russian TPF exports, as explained in recital 73, and are the only relevant markets which can be considered. The Commission therefore rejected this claim.

4.3.3. *Imports from third countries other than the countries concerned*

(102) The imports of TPF from third countries other than the countries concerned were mainly from China and Cambodia.

(103) The (aggregated) volume of imports into the Union as well as the market share and price trends for imports of TPF from other third countries developed as follows:

Table 3

Imports from third countries

Country		2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
China	Volume (tonnes)	5 809	4 623	6 302	8 903	9 774
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*80*	*108*	*153*	*168*
	Market share	12,3 %	10,0 %	12,7 %	18,2 %	20,4 %
	Average price (EUR/tonne)	1 768	2 244	2 590	2 026	1 889
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*127*	*147*	*115*	*107*
Cambodia	Volume (tonnes)	2 687	2 294	3 792	4 984	5 156
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*85*	*141*	*185*	*192*
	Market share	5,7 %	5,0 %	7,7 %	10,2 %	10,8 %
	Average price (EUR/tonne)	1 569	1 900	2 383	1 923	1 905

([28]) See also recital 128 of Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2019/566 of 9 April 2019 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of certain tube and pipe fittings originating in the Russian Federation, the Republic of Korea and Malaysia following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of the Regulation (EU) 2016/1036 of the European Parliament and of the Council and terminating the investigation concerning the imports of the same product originating in the Republic of Turkey (OJ L 99, 10.4.2019, p. 9).

Country		2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*121*	*152*	*123*	*121*
Other third countries except China and Cambodia	Volume (tonnes)	9 795	10 655	13 269	15 029	13 968
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*109*	*135*	*153*	*143*
	Market share	20,7 %	23,1 %	26,8 %	30,8 %	29,2 %
	Average price (EUR/tonne)	2 718	3 198	4 070	4 207	4 325
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*118*	*150*	*155*	*159*
Total of all third countries except the countries concerned	Volume (tonnes)	18 291	17 572	23 363	28 916	28 897
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*96*	*128*	*158*	*158*
	Market share	38,7 %	38,1 %	47,2 %	59,2 %	60,3 %
	Average price (EUR/tonne)	2 247	2 778	3 397	3 142	3 069
	Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*124*	*151*	*140*	*137*

Source: Eurostat.

(104) While Union consumption remained stable throughout the period concerned, imports from other third countries, most importantly China and Cambodia, increased from 18 291 tonnes in 2020 to 28 897 tonnes in the review investigation period. This resulted in an increase in market share of more than 20 percentage points to 60,3 % in the review investigation period. At the same time, as seen in Table 5 below, the market share of the Union industry decreased by a similar degree from 60,9 % to 39,5 %.

(105) Import prices from China and Cambodia increased by 7 % and 21 % respectively throughout the period considered, which is far below the price levels of the Union industry shown in Table 7 below, both in terms of increase (Union prices increased by 95 % during the period considered) and in terms of absolute price levels (average import prices from China and Cambodia were 1 889 and 1 905 euro per tonne, respectively, versus an average Union sales price of 5 033 euro per tonne).

(106) The import prices of the remaining third countries also increased throughout the period considered, but to a larger degree (59 %) than those of China and Cambodia. As the average import price from these other third countries also remained below the average Union sales price throughout the period considered, this resulted in an increased market share though at a lesser degree (less than nine percentage points increase in market share) than the combined market share of China and Cambodia.

4.4. Economic situation of the Union industry

4.4.1. *General remarks*

(107) The assessment of the economic situation of the Union industry included an evaluation of all economic indicators having a bearing on the state of the Union industry during the period considered.

(108) As mentioned in recital 21, sampling was used for the assessment of the economic situation of the Union industry.

(109) For the injury determination, the Commission distinguished between macroeconomic and microeconomic injury indicators. The Commission evaluated the macroeconomic indicators on the basis of the information provided by the applicant, which data related to all Union producers. The Commission calculated the microeconomic indicators on the basis of data contained in the questionnaire replies from the sampled Union producers and the verification visits at the premises of the companies.

(110) The macroeconomic indicators are: production, production capacity, capacity utilisation, sales volume, market share, employment, productivity, magnitude of the dumping margin, and recovery from past dumping.

(111) The microeconomic indicators are: average unit prices, unit cost, labour costs, inventories, profitability, cash flow, investments, return on investments, and ability to raise capital.

4.4.2. *Macroeconomic indicators*

4.4.2.1. Production, production capacity and capacity utilisation

(112) The total Union production, production capacity and capacity utilisation developed over the period considered as follows:

Table 4

Production, production capacity and capacity utilisation

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Production volume (tonnes)	34 033	32 821	34 707	25 675	24 368
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*96*	*102*	*75*	*72*
Production capacity (tonnes)	142 526	142 526	142 526	142 526	142 526
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*	*100*
Capacity utilisation	23 %	22 %	23 %	17 %	16 %
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*97*	*102*	*76*	*72*

Source: Applicant, sampled Union producers.

(113) The production volume decreased by 28 % during the period considered. More specifically, it remained rather stable from 2020 to 2022 and decreased significantly in 2023 and further during the review investigation period. This follows the trend in the opposite direction for imports from third countries, and specifically China and Cambodia, whose imports increased significantly in 2023 and further during the review investigation period. This also coincided with the trend in the Union's cost of production which started increasing in 2022, increased significantly in 2023 and further in the review investigation period. This forced the Union industry to increase their sales prices to attain a certain level of profitability, resulting in less competitive prices vis-à-vis imports from third countries, lower sales levels, loss of market share and consequently lower production levels.

(114) During the period considered, the production capacity remained the same, with as a consequence a decrease in capacity utilization by 28 % during the same period. Capacity utilization was very low throughout the period considered (23 %-16 %). In line with previous expiry investigations ([29]) this low level is partly due to the method to calculate total capacity for this particular industry, where the reported capacity is a theoretical maximum capacity (based on, among other things, 3 shifts / day), which does not necessarily accurately reflect the actual capacity. Nevertheless, even if the capacity were to reflect 1 shift per day, hence dividing total capacity by three, the capacity utilization rate would only be at 50 % which is not a long-term sustainable level.

4.4.2.2. Sales volume and market share

(115) The Union industry's sales volume and market share developed over the period considered as follows:

Table 5

Sales volume and market share (tonnes)

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Total sales volume on the Union market	28 776	28 563	26 049	19 869	18 916
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*99*	*91*	*69*	*66*
Market share	60,9 %	61,9 %	52,7 %	40,7 %	39,5 %
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*102*	*86*	*67*	*65*

Source: Applicant, sampled Union producers and Eurostat.

(116) Total sales of the Union industry on the Union market decreased by 34 % during the period considered, while Union consumption remained stable. The Union's market share decreased by more than 20 percentage points over the period considered. The Union industry's sales volume decreased on a yearly basis, but especially between 2022 and 2023. As explained in recital 113, this coincided with the large increase in the cost of production and the related increased sales prices.

([29]) Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1934, recitals 81 and 82; Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2022/95, recital 120.

4.4.2.3. Employment and productivity

(117) Employment and productivity developed over the period considered as follows:

Table 6

Employment and productivity

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Number of employees	953	864	860	823	818
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*91*	*90*	*86*	*86*
Productivity (tonne/employee)	36	38	40	31	30
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*106*	*113*	*87*	*83*

Source: Applicant, sampled Union producers.

(118) Employment of the Union industry decreased by 14 % during the period considered. However, since production levels decreased even more, the productivity level per employee decreased by 17 % during the period considered.

4.4.2.4. Growth

(119) Consumption remained stable during the period considered. The sales volumes of the Union industry decreased by 34 %, which translated into a loss in market share of 35 %.

4.4.2.5. Magnitude of the dumping margin and recovery from past dumping

(120) As explained in recitals 53, 37 and 68, it was not possible to establish an affirmative determination of dumping for any of the countries concerned during the review investigation period. The investigation therefore focused on the likelihood of a recurrence of dumping should the anti-dumping measures be repealed.

(121) In the previous expiry review the Union industry's financial and economic situation had deteriorated further during the period considered of that investigation. During the period considered of the current expiry review investigation, the Union industry's situation started showing signs of recovery from the effects of past dumping as demonstrated by a favourable trend for the Union industry of some of the main injury indicators. Nevertheless, for other indicators the situation continued to deteriorate as will be set out below.

4.4.3. *Microeconomic indicators*

4.4.3.1. Prices and factors affecting prices

(122) The weighted average unit sales prices of the sampled Union producers to unrelated customers in the Union developed over the period considered as follows:

Table 7

Sales prices and cost of production in the Union (EUR/tonne)

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Average unit sales price in the Union	2 579	2 984	4 265	5 050	5 033

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*116*	*165*	*196*	*195*
Unit cost of production	3 265	3 154	3 718	4 409	4 504
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*97*	*114*	*135*	*138*

Source: Sampled Union producers.

(123) The Union industry's average unit sales price to unrelated customers in the Union increased by 95 % over the period considered and reached EUR 5 033 per tonne in the review investigation period. The Union industry chose to adjust its prices upward to reflect the significant increase in the cost of production, mostly driven by the increase in raw material, energy and labour costs during the period considered. In addition, the Union industry is gradually increasing the production of specialised, premium products instead of commodity items in order to remain competitive in light of the continuing low-priced imports from third countries. The sales prices and cost of production for such non-commodity products tended to be higher on average.

(124) The average cost of production also increased during the period considered, albeit by a lesser extent i.e. 38 %, reaching EUR 4 504 per tonne in the review investigation period.

4.4.3.2. Labour costs

(125) The average labour costs of the sampled Union producers developed over the period considered as follows:

Table 8

Average labour costs per employee

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Average labour costs per employee (EUR)	59 463	65 016	71 578	80 413	83 001
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*109*	*120*	*135*	*140*

Source: Sampled Union producers.

(126) The average labour cost per employee increased by 40 %, which has followed the Union-wide increase in labour costs over the past years ([30]).

([30]) For labour cost trends in the Union, see: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Labour_cost_index_-_recent_trends#Overview.

4.4.3.3. Inventories

(127) Stock levels of the sampled Union producers developed over the period considered as follows:

Table 9

Inventories

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Closing stocks (tonnes)	5 817	5 576	7 357	7 493	7 754
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*96*	*126*	*129*	*133*
Closing stocks as a percentage of production	32 %	34 %	39 %	56 %	61 %
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*105*	*120*	*173*	*191*

Source: Sampled Union producers.

(128) The level of closing stock of the sampled Union producers increased by 33 % over the period considered, reflecting the decrease in sales volumes of especially the commodity-type TPF during this time. In the review investigation period, the level of stock represented 61 % of the sampled Union producers' production.

4.4.3.4. Profitability, cash flow, investments, return on investments and ability to raise capital

(129) Profitability, cash flow, investments and return on investments of the sampled Union producers developed over the period considered as follows:

Table 10

Profitability, cash flow, investments and return on investments

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Profitability of sales in the Union to unrelated customers (% of sales turnover)	- 9,8 %	- 3,9 %	8,1 %	4,2 %	2,4 %
Index (2020 = 100)	*- 100*	*- 39*	*82*	*43*	*25*
Cash flow (EUR)	2 395 410	6 978 406	13 624 003	9 814 191	5 909 442
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*291*	*569*	*410*	*247*
Investments (EUR)	2 112 756	2 130 532	822 751	1 627 877	1 712 697
Index (2020 = 100)	*100*	*101*	*39*	*77*	*81*

	2020	2021	2022	2023	Review investigation period
Return on investments	- 13 %	- 7 %	12 %	1 %	- 3 %
Index (2020 = -100)	*- 100*	*- 59*	*97*	*11*	*- 26*

Source: Sampled Union producers.

(130) The Commission established the profitability of the sampled Union producers by expressing the pre-tax net profit of the sales of the like product to unrelated customers in the Union as a percentage of the turnover of those sales. Due to the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the international flow of goods in 2020 and 2021, the Union industry managed to increase its sales prices to achieve a profitable level for the first time in many years in 2022. However, in 2023 and 2024 the combined effects of the invasion of Ukraine by Russia leading to an increase of the cost of production and the pressure of low-priced imports from third countries lowered the profit levels to 2,4 % during the review investigation period.

(131) The net cash flow is the ability of the Union producers to self-finance their activities. The trend in net cash flow developed positively during the period considered, allowing the Union industry to invest in necessary maintenance and replacement of machinery.

(132) The return on investments is the profit in percentage of the net book value of investments. It fluctuated during the period concerned and reached -3 % during the review investigation period.

4.5. **Conclusion on injury**

(133) Despite some improvements especially in the post-pandemic years, which is reflected in a slightly profitable situation in the review investigation period, the situation of the Union industry remains precarious. Consumption remained stable while imports from third countries continuously increased throughout the period concerned, resulting in decreased production volumes, capacity utilisation and sales levels, culminating in a decrease in market share from 60,9 % to 39,5 %.

(134) In addition, there was an increase in stock levels, a decrease in number of employees and productivity levels while the cash flows levels – although positive – did not allow for investments other than those necessary to maintain production in the Union. The continuing uncertainty surrounding the planned switch to sustainable energy sources has put most long-term energy projects on hold awaiting decisions in those areas. This has had a negative influence on the Union industry in combination with increased costs and increased imports from third countries. At the same time, the Union industry has managed to keep its export performance at a consistently high level, thereby mitigating the negative effects of the Union domestic market on the Union industry.

(135) Imports from the countries concerned remained at negligible or inexistant levels throughout the period concerned, while imports from other third countries (mainly Cambodia and China) increased significantly at consistently low-price levels.

(136) On the basis of the above, the Commission concluded that the Union industry suffered material injury within the meaning of Article 3(5) of the basic Regulation during the review investigation period. Due to the virtually inexistant imports from the three countries concerned, the Commission also concluded that the injury to the Union industry observed during the review investigation period could not have been caused by imports from Korea, Malaysia or Russia.

(137) In view of the above, the Commission further examined the likelihood of recurrence of injury originally caused by dumped imports from Korea, Malaysia or Russia if measures were repealed.

5. LIKELIHOOD OF RECURRENCE OF INJURY

(138) The Commission concluded in recital 136 that the Union industry suffered material injury during the review investigation period. The Commission also concluded in the same recital that the injury to the Union industry observed during the review investigation period could not have been caused by dumped imports from Korea, Malaysia or Russia due to their very limited volume. Therefore, the Commission assessed, in accordance with Article 11(2) of the basic Regulation, whether there would be a likelihood of recurrence of injury originally caused by the dumped imports from the countries concerned if the measures were allowed to lapse.

(139) In this regard, the Commission examined the production capacity and spare capacity in the countries concerned, the relationship between export prices to third countries and the price level in the Union, likely price levels of imports from the countries concerned in the absence of anti-dumping measures and their impact on the Union industry's situation and the attractiveness of the Union market, as well as trade restrictive measures by other countries.

5.1. Production and spare capacity

(140) As established in recitals 60, 48, and 77, the spare capacity in the three countries concerned was estimated to be around 279 000 tonnes in the review investigation period, which is more than five times the Union consumption during the same period.

(141) In addition, there were no elements found that could indicate a significant increase of domestic demand of TPF in Korea, Malaysia, Russia or in any other third country in the near future. The Commission therefore concluded that domestic demand in the three countries concerned or other third country markets would not be able to absorb the available spare capacity. Considering the stable levels of Union consumption during the period considered, and projections of increased demand in the near future following decisions on sustainable energy projects, this spare capacity could be used to produce the product under review for export to the Union if measures were allowed to lapse ([31]).

5.2. Possible price levels of imports from Korea, Malaysia and Russia

(142) There was no cooperation from exporting producers in any of the countries concerned. Furthermore, no reliable import prices into the Union could be established in view of the negligible or inexistent import quantities.

(143) The Commission performed a price analysis without anti-dumping measures based on export prices to third countries to establish how the imports from the three countries concerned would affect Union industry should the measures be terminated. This showed that import prices from Korea, Malaysia and Russia would likely undercut Union industry prices by 10,0 %, 56,7 % and 44,3 % respectively.

5.3. Trade restrictions by other countries

(144) As indicated in recital 64, anti-dumping measures on TPF imports in the United States had been extended to Malaysia since July 2018. This implies that the access to one of the largest export markets for TPF (the United States) has been restricted. Considering the attractiveness of the Union market and in the case of Russian exporters the proximity of the Union market under normal circumstances, as described in sections 3.2.2.3, 3.3.2.3, and 3.4.2.3, there is a strong likelihood that these exporting producers will redirect their exports of TPF to the Union market if measures were to lapse.

([31]) This is especially so for Korea and Russia, both for which the spare capacity exceeds total Union consumption during the RIP, while Malaysia's spare capacity is more than 50 % of the Union's consumption.

(145) In addition, current geopolitical uncertainties and sweeping reciprocal trade restrictions on the world market, especially related to steel such as those imposed by the United States in March 2025 ([32]) will most likely lead to a redirection of trade flows by countries under measures to those with lower or no restrictive trade measures in place. At this time the impact of these actions cannot be predicted, but it is likely that at least part of these world exports will be redirected towards the Union.

5.4. Impact on the Union industry

(146) In light of the large overcapacities in all three countries concerned, the low average import prices from those countries and the attractiveness of the Union market, the Union industry would be under significant price pressure from Korea, Malaysia and Russia should the measures be repealed. A potentially large influx of dumped imports would aggravate the Union's already fragile economic situation. This could lead to financial losses and potentially the demise of the Union industry, which already operates at very low production and sales levels, and which has managed to achieve only a marginal positive profit level in a situation without these dumped imports.

(147) On this basis, the Commission concluded that the absence of measures would in all likelihood result in a significant increase of dumped imports from Korea, Malaysia and Russia at injurious prices and material injury would be likely to recur.

6. UNION INTEREST

(148) In accordance with Article 21 of the basic Regulation, the Commission examined whether maintaining the existing anti-dumping measures would be against the interest of the Union as whole. The determination of the Union interest was based on an appreciation of all the various interests involved, including those of the Union industry, importers, and users.

6.1. Interest of the Union industry

(149) As concluded in recital 136, the Union industry suffered material injury during the review investigation period, as confirmed by the negative trends of most injury indicators. It was also concluded in recital 147 that if the anti-dumping measures were allowed to lapse, injury would recur.

(150) Overall, despite the injurious situation of the Union industry in the Union market, the Commission considered that the industry remains viable. This was based on the fact that not only did the industry manage to return to a profitable situation after years of losses, but also the export performance of the Union industry remains consistently strong, with export sales accounting for a significant share of the total sales volume. However, the Union industry still shows very low levels of capacity utilization with decreasing production levels and decreasing productivity, while the profit levels remain very low and have yet to reach the profit levels which could be achieved under normal circumstances.

(151) If measures were allowed to lapse, it is likely that the influx of dumped imports from the three countries concerned will have a devastating effect on the Union industry, again lowering their profit levels with the risk of a further decrease in production or even the closure of production sites in the Union. Therefore, it can be concluded that the continuation of measures against Korea, Malaysia and Russia would be in the interest of the Union industry.

([32]) See: https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/04/regulating-imports-with-a-reciprocal-tariff-to-rectify-trade-practices-that-contribute-to-large-and-persistent-annual-united-states-goods-trade-deficits/.

6.2. Interest of unrelated importers, traders and users

(152) Thirty-five importers and users were contacted at the initiation of the investigation and invited to cooperate. However, none of them cooperated in the current investigation or submitted any information, with the exception of one importer who expressed its support for the existing anti-dumping measures. It is also recalled that in the previous investigations on TPF, it was found that the imposition of measures was not likely to have a serious negative effect in the situation of importers and users in the Union.

(153) Users did not submit any information showing that there have been difficulties in sourcing TPF, nor did the investigation determine otherwise. In fact, recitals 102 to 106 showed that the market share of imports from third countries other than the countries concerned exceeds that of the Union industry, meaning that users and importers are sourcing their TPF mostly from those third countries.

(154) It was shown in the previous investigations, that the importers and users were able to transfer the price increase caused by the anti-dumping measures. There were no elements found during this investigation to contradict this conclusion. This is also due to the fact that TPF functions as connectors of pipes and tubes used in the petrochemical and construction sector. As such, TPF accounts for only a minor part of the overall cost in these sectors, as compared with the much more sizeable impact of the cost of the pipes and tubes themselves.

(155) On this basis, and in line with the conclusions drawn in previous investigations, it is expected that the continuation of the measures will not have a significant negative impact on users or importers.

6.3. Conclusion on Union interest

(156) On the basis of the above, the Commission concluded that there were no compelling reasons of the Union interest against the maintenance of the existing measures on imports of TPF originating in Korea, Malaysia and Russia.

7. ANTI-DUMPING MEASURES

(157) On the basis of the conclusions reached by the Commission on continuation of dumping, recurrence of injury and Union interest, the anti-dumping measures on imports of TPF originating in Korea, Malaysia and Russia should be maintained.

(158) To minimize the risks of circumvention due to the difference in duty rates, special measures are needed to ensure the application of the individual anti-dumping duties. The application of individual anti-dumping duties is only applicable upon presentation of a valid commercial invoice to the customs authorities of the Member States. The invoice must conform to the requirements set out in Article 1(3) of this regulation. Until such invoice is presented, imports should be subject to the anti-dumping duty applicable to 'all other companies'.

(159) While presentation of this invoice is necessary for the customs authorities of the Member States to apply the individual rates of anti-dumping duty and exemptions to imports, it is not the only element to be taken into account by the customs authorities. Indeed, even if presented with an invoice meeting all the requirements set out in Article 1(3) of this Regulation, the customs authorities of Member States must carry out their usual checks and may, like in all other cases, require additional documents (shipping documents, etc.) for the purpose of verifying the accuracy of the particulars contained in the declaration and ensure that the subsequent application of the lower rate of duty is justified, in compliance with customs law.

(160) Should the exports by one of the companies benefiting from lower individual duty rates increase significantly in volume after the imposition of the measures concerned, such an increase in volume could be considered as constituting in itself a change in the pattern of trade due to the imposition of measures within the meaning of Article 13(1) of the basic Regulation. In such circumstances and provided the conditions are met an anti-circumvention investigation may be initiated. This investigation may, inter alia, examine the need for the removal of individual duty rate(s) and the consequent imposition of a country-wide duty.

(161) The individual company anti-dumping duty rates specified in this Regulation are exclusively applicable to imports of the product under review originating in the countries concerned and produced by the named legal entities. Imports of the product under review produced by any other company not specifically mentioned in the operative part of this Regulation, including entities related to those specifically mentioned, should be subject to the duty rate applicable to 'all other companies'. They should not be subject to any of the individual anti-dumping duty rates.

(162) A company may request the application of these individual anti-dumping duty rates if it subsequently changes the name of its entity. The request must be addressed to the Commission ([33]). The request must contain all the relevant information enabling to demonstrate that the change does not affect the right of the company to benefit from the duty rate which applies to it. If the change of name of the company does not affect its right to benefit from the duty rate which applies to it, a regulation about the change of name will be published in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

(163) All interested parties were informed of the essential facts and considerations on the basis of which it was intended to recommend that the existing measures be maintained. They were also granted a period to make representations subsequent to this disclosure.

(164) An exporter or producer that did not export the product concerned to the Union during the period that was used to set the level of the duty currently applicable to its exports may request the Commission to be made subject to the anti-dumping duty rate for cooperating companies not included in the sample. The Commission should grant such request, provided that three conditions are met. The new exporting producer would have to demonstrate that: (i) it did not export the product concerned to the Union during the period that was used to set the level of the duty applicable to its exports; (ii) it is not related to a company that did so and thus is subject to the anti-dumping duties; and (iii) has exported the product concerned thereafter or has entered into an irrevocable contractual obligation to do so in substantial quantities.

(165) In view of Article 109 of Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 of the European Parliament and of the Council ([34]) when an amount is to be reimbursed following a judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union, the interest to be paid should be the rate applied by the European Central Bank to its principal refinancing operations, as published in the C series of the Official Journal of the European Union on the first calendar day of each month.

(166) The measures provided for in this regulation are in accordance with the opinion of the Committee established by Article 15(1) Regulation (EU) 2016/1036,

HAS ADOPTED THIS REGULATION:

Article 1

1. A definitive anti-dumping duty is imposed on imports of tube or pipe fittings (other than cast fittings, flanges and threaded fittings), of iron or steel (not including stainless steel), with a greatest external diameter not exceeding 609,6 mm, of a kind used for butt-welding or other purposes, currently falling under CN codes ex 7307 93 11, ex 7307 93 19 and ex 7307 99 80 (TARIC codes 7307 93 11 91, 7307 93 11 93, 7307 93 11 94, 7307 93 11 95, 7307 93 11 99, 7307 93 19 91, 7307 93 19 93, 7307 93 19 94, 7307 93 19 95, 7307 93 19 99, 7307 99 80 92, 7307 99 80 93, 7307 99 80 94, 7307 99 80 95 and 7307 99 80 98) and originating in the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and the Russian Federation.

([33]) Email: TRADE-TDI-NAME-CHANGE-REQUESTS@ec.europa.eu; European Commission, Directorate-General for Trade, Directorate G, Wetstraat 170 Rue de la Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium.

([34]) Regulation (EU, Euratom) 2024/2509 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 September 2024 on the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union (OJ L, 2024/2509, 26.9.2024, ELI: http://data.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/2509/oj).

2. The rates of the definitive anti-dumping duty applicable to the net, free-at-Union-frontier price, before duty, of the product described in paragraph 1 and produced by the companies listed below shall be as follows:

Country	Company	Anti-dumping duty	TARIC additional code
Republic of Korea	TK Corporation, 1499-1, Songjeong-Dong, Gangseo-Gu, Busan	32,4 %	C066
	All other companies	44,0 %	C999
Malaysia	Anggerik Laksana Sdn Bhd, Selangor Darul Ehsan	59,2 %	A324
	Pantech Steel Industries Sdn Bhd	49,9 %	A961
	All other companies	75,0 %	A999
Russian Federation	All companies	23,8 %	_

3. The application of the individual duty rates specified for the companies mentioned in paragraph 2 shall be conditional upon presentation to the Member States' customs authorities of a valid commercial invoice, on which shall appear a declaration dated and signed by an official of the entity issuing such invoice, identified by his/her name and function, drafted as follows: 'I, the undersigned, certify that the (volume) of (product under review) sold for export to the European Union covered by this invoice was manufactured by (company name and address) (TARIC additional code) in [country concerned]. I declare that the information provided in this invoice is complete and correct.' Until such invoice is presented, the duty applicable to all other companies shall apply.

4. Article 1(2) may be amended to add new exporting producers from the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and the Russian Federation and make them subject to the appropriate weighted average anti-dumping duty rate for cooperating companies not included in the sample. A new exporting producer shall provide evidence that:

(a) it did not export the goods described in Article 1(1) originating in the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and the Russian Federation during the period between 1 April 2000 to 31 March 2001 ('original investigation period');

(b) it is not related to an exporter or producer subject to the measures imposed by this Regulation, and which have or could have cooperated in the investigation that led to the duty; and

(c) it has either actually exported the product under review originating in the Republic of Korea, Malaysia and the Russian Federation or has entered into an irrevocable contractual obligation to export a significant quantity to the Union after the end of the original investigation period.

5. Unless otherwise specified, the provisions in force concerning customs duties shall apply.

Article 2

This Regulation shall enter into force on the day following that of its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

This Regulation shall be binding in its entirety and directly applicable in all Member States.

Done at Brussels, 2 July 2025.

For the Commission
The President
Ursula VON DER LEYEN