



OCTG5 2025 IN

BY EMAIL: ottawa@ticaret.gov.tr; embassy.ottawa@mfa.gov.tr; ottawa@trade.gov.tr;
basbuga@ticaret.gov.tr

Halil İbrahim Karataş
Commercial Counsellor
Embassy of the Republic of Türkiye
197 Wurtemberg Street
Ottawa, ON K1N 8L9

March 23, 2026

Dear Halil İbrahim Karataş:

This refers to the notice dated December 22, 2025, informing you that the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) had made a preliminary determination of dumping with respect to certain oil country tubular goods (OCTG) originating in or exported from the United Mexican States and the Republic of the Philippines, and originating in the Republic of Türkiye and exported or produced by, or on behalf of, Borusan Mannesmann Boru Sanayi ve Ticaret A.Ş., originating in the Republic of Korea and exported or produced by, or on behalf of, Hyundai Steel Company, and originating in the United States of America and exported or produced by, or on behalf of, Tenaris S.A. (collectively, “the subject countries and exporters/producers”).

Today, pursuant to paragraph 41(1)(b) of the *Special Import Measures Act* (SIMA), the CBSA has made a final determination of dumping concerning OCTG from the subject countries and exporters/producers.

A *Statement of Reasons*, which summarizes the information on which this decision was based and which describes, in general terms, the future activities related to the investigation, will be issued within 15 days on the CBSA’s website at www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/sima. A summary of the results of the final determination is contained in **Attachment 1** of this letter.

The Canadian International Trade Tribunal’s (CITT) inquiry into the question of injury to the Canadian industry is continuing, and it will issue its decision by April 21, 2026. Provisional duties will continue to be imposed on OCTG from the subject countries and exporters/producers until the CITT renders its decision.

If there is an injury finding, subject goods released from the CBSA following the date of the CITT’s finding will be subject to anti-dumping duty. If the CITT finds that the dumped goods have not caused injury and do not threaten to cause injury, all proceedings will be terminated. In such circumstances, imports will not be subject to anti-dumping duty and all provisional duties paid or security posted will be returned.

.../2

Any person directly affected by this final determination may make an application to the Federal Court of Appeal pursuant to section 96.1 of SIMA to review and set aside the CBSA's decisions. The grounds for requesting judicial review are outlined in **Attachment 2** of this letter.

Should you have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Shawn Ryan, A/Assistant Director, Trade Remedies Investigations Division at 902-943-9978, or by email at Shawn.Ryan@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Borg', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Sean Borg
A/ Executive Director
Trade Programs Directorate

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Margins of Dumping**
2. **Judicial Review under SIMA**

APPENDIX 1

MARGINS OF DUMPING

Country of Origin/Export or Exporter	Margins of Dumping (% of Export Price)
Mexico	
Tubos de Acero de Mexico S.A.	30.7%
Philippines	
HLD Clark Steel Pipe Co. Ltd.	16.7%
All Other Exporters	57.5%
South Korea	
Hyundai Steel Pipe Co., Ltd.	13.6%
Türkiye	
Borusan Birleşik Boru Fabrikaları Sanayi Ve Ticaret A.Ş.	11.0%
United States	
Maverick Tube Corporation	13.9%

Note: The margins of dumping reported in the table above are the margins determined by the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA) for purposes of the final determination of dumping. These margins do not reflect the anti-dumping duty to be levied on future importations of dumped goods. In the event of an injury finding by the Canadian International Trade Tribunal, normal values have been provided to the exporters which provided sufficient information for future shipments to Canada and these normal values would come into effect the day after the injury finding. Information regarding normal values of the subject goods should be obtained from the exporter.

Imports of subject goods from exporters/producers that did not provide sufficient information to the CBSA during the dumping investigation and who are not listed in the table above will be subject to the All Other Exporters anti-dumping duty rate pursuant to a ministerial specification. Specifically, normal values for these exporters will be determined by advancing the export price by 167.0% for Mexico, 57.5% for the Philippines, 57.4% for South Korea, 67.9% for Türkiye, and 33.5% for the United States of America, of the export price, pursuant to Ministerial Specification. The export price is generally the lesser of the exporter's selling price or the importer's purchase price as provided for in section 24 of SIMA.

Normally, normal values will not be applied retroactively. However, normal values may be applied retroactively in cases where the exporter does not adjust export prices to account for increases in domestic prices and/or costs that affect values for SIMA purposes. Therefore, where substantial changes occur in prices, market conditions, costs associated with production and sales of the goods, the onus is on the concerned parties to increase the export price accordingly to ensure that any sale made to Canada is not only above the normal value but at or above selling prices and full costs and profit of the goods in the exporter's domestic market.

ATTACHMENT 2

JUDICIAL REVIEW UNDER THE *SPECIAL IMPORT MEASURES ACT*

Any person directly affected by a decision or final determination made by the President of the Canada Border Services Agency (President), pursuant to paragraph 41(1)(b) of the *Special Import Measures Act*, may ask to have the decision or final determination reviewed by the Federal Court of Appeal (Federal Court).

An application to the Federal Court may only be made on the grounds that, in making the final determination or decision, the President:

- (a) acted without jurisdiction, acted beyond the jurisdiction of the President or refused to exercise that jurisdiction;
- (b) failed to observe a principle of natural justice, procedural fairness or other procedure that the President was required by law to observe;
- (c) erred in law in making a decision, whether or not the error appears on the face of the record;
- (d) based a decision on an erroneous finding of fact that the President made in a perverse or capricious manner or without regard for the material before the President;
- (e) acted, or failed to act, by reason of fraud or perjured evidence; or
- (f) acted in any other way that was contrary to law.