



OTTAWA, February 17, 2026

OCTG6 2026 IN

STATEMENT OF REASONS

Concerning the initiation of the investigation into the alleged dumping of

OIL AND GAS WELL CASING AND GREEN TUBE CASING, MADE OF CARBON OR ALLOY STEEL, WELDED OR SEAMLESS, HEAT-TREATED OR NOT HEAT-TREATED, REGARDLESS OF END FINISH, HAVING AN OUTSIDE DIAMETER FROM 4 ½” INCHES TO 9 5/8” INCHES (114.3 MM TO 245.2 MM), MEETING OR SUPPLIED TO MEET AMERICAN PETROLEUM INSTITUTE (API) SPECIFICATION 5CT OR EQUIVALENT AND/OR ENHANCED PROPRIETARY STANDARDS, IN ALL GRADES, ORIGINATING IN OR EXPORTED FROM THE REPUBLIC OF AUSTRIA

DECISION

Pursuant to subsection 31(1) of the *Special Import Measures Act*, the Canada Border Services Agency initiated an investigation on February 2, 2026, respecting the alleged threat of injurious dumping of certain oil and gas well casing originating in or exported from the Republic of Austria.

Cet *Énoncé des motifs* est également disponible en français.
This *Statement of Reasons* is also available in French.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY	1
INTERESTED PARTIES	1
COMPLAINANT	1
OTHER PRODUCERS	1
TRADE UNIONS	2
EXPORTERS	2
IMPORTERS	2
PRODUCT INFORMATION	2
PRODUCT DEFINITION	2
ADDITIONAL PRODUCT INFORMATION	3
PRODUCT SPECIFICATIONS AND USAGE	4
PRODUCTION PROCESS	5
CLASSIFICATION OF IMPORTS	6
LIKE GOODS AND CLASS OF GOODS	6
THE CANADIAN INDUSTRY	7
DOMESTIC PRODUCERS	7
STANDING	7
THE CANADIAN MARKET	9
EVIDENCE OF DUMPING	11
NORMAL VALUE	11
COMPLAINANTS' ESTIMATES OF NORMAL VALUE	11
COST OF PRODUCTION	11
<i>GS&A AND PROFIT</i>	13
CBSA'S ESTIMATE OF NORMAL VALUE	13
COST OF PRODUCTION	13
<i>GS&A AND PROFIT</i>	14
EXPORT PRICE	15
ESTIMATED MARGINS OF DUMPING	16
EVIDENCE OF THREAT OF INJURY	16
PRICE UNDERCUTTING	18
LIKELY INCREASE IN VOLUME ON DIVERSION FROM UNITED STATES	20
MARKET SHARE	21
ADVERSE IMPACT ON FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AND PROFITABILITY	22
NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON EXISTING DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENTS	23
THREAT OF INJURY CONCLUSION	23
CAUSAL LINK - DUMPING AND THREAT OF INJURY	24
SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION	24
FUTURE ACTION	24
RETROACTIVE DUTY ON MASSIVE IMPORTATIONS	25
UNDERTAKINGS	26
PUBLICATION	26
CONTACT US	26

SUMMARY

[1] On November 27, 2025, the complainant, Tenaris Canada, filed a complaint with the Trade and Anti-dumping Programs Directorate of the Canada Border Services Agency (CBSA).

[2] The complainant alleged that imports into Canada of certain oil and gas well casing originating in or exported from the Republic of Austria and from the United States of America, and exported or produced by, or on behalf of, Welded Tube USA, Inc.(WT USA) are being dumped and threatening to injure the Canadian industry.

[3] On December 18, 2025, the CBSA informed the complainant that the complaint was properly documented. On January 9, 2026, the CBSA informed the Governments of Austria and the United States of America (United States) that a properly documented complaint has been filed.

[4] The CBSA has analyzed the information presented by the complainant and has conducted research into other supplementary data.

[5] The information available provides a reasonable indication that the above-named goods from Austria have been dumped and that this dumping is threatening to cause injury to the Canadian industry producing these goods.

[6] On February 2, 2026, pursuant to subsection 31(1) of SIMA, the CBSA initiated an investigation respecting the dumping of certain oil and gas well casing from Austria.

[7] On the same date, the CBSA notified the complainant, Tenaris Canada, that an investigation had not been initiated with respect to the goods from WT USA, as the evidence did not demonstrate a reasonable indication that a threat of injury was clearly foreseeable and imminent. Details with respect to the CBSA's analysis of the threat of injury from WT USA were provided to Tenaris Canada.

INTERESTED PARTIES

COMPLAINANT

[8] The names and addresses of the complainant is as follows:

Tenaris Canada
530 8 Ave SW, Suite 400
Calgary, Alberta T2P 3S8

OTHER PRODUCERS

Interpro Pipe & Steel Inc. ¹
P.O. Box 1670

¹ Formerly, Evraz.

100 Armour Road Regina, SK S0G 5K0

Welded Tube of Canada Corporation
111 Rayette Road
Concord, Ontario L4K 2E9

[9] The CBSA is not aware of any other producers of oil and gas well casing in Canada.

TRADE UNIONS

[10] Tenaris Canada identified Local Union 9548 as the relevant union for Algoma. Interpro's relevant USW union locals are Local Union 5890 (Regina) and Local Union 6673 (Calgary). WTC's relevant USW union local is USW 8328 (Toronto). UNIFOR represents persons employed in casing production at Interpro and WTC facilities in Canada, with the relevant UNIFOR local being UNIFOR 551 (Camrose, AB) for Interpro and UNIFOR 199 (St. Catharines, ON) for WTC. Iron Workers 805 (St. Albert, AB) is another trade union representing persons employed in Interpro's Casing production.²

EXPORTERS

[11] The CBSA identified one exporter of the subject goods from Austria from CBSA import documentation and from information submitted in the complaint. All potential exporters were asked to respond to the CBSA's Dumping Request for Information (RFI).

IMPORTERS

[12] The CBSA identified one importer of the subject goods from CBSA import documentation and from information submitted in the complaint. All potential importers were asked to respond to the CBSA's Importer RFI.

PRODUCT INFORMATION

PRODUCT DEFINITION³

[13] For the purpose of this investigation, subject goods are defined as:

² Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 111.

³ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 33.

Oil and gas well casing and green tube casing, made of carbon or alloy steel, welded or seamless, heat-treated or not heat-treated, regardless of end finish, having an outside diameter from 4 ½” inches to 9 5/8” inches (114.3 mm to 245.2 mm), meeting or supplied to meet American Petroleum Institute (API) specification 5CT or equivalent and/or enhanced proprietary standards, in all grades, originating in or exported from the Republic of Austria but excluding the following:

- drill pipe;
- pup joints;
- unattached couplings;
- coupling stock;
- insulated tubing and vacuum insulated tubing; and
- stainless steel casing containing 10.5 percent or more by weight of chromium

ADDITIONAL PRODUCT INFORMATION ⁴

[14] For greater certainty, the product definition does not include oil and gas well tubing but it does include semi-finished casing, which is typically referred to as “green tubes” or occasionally “green pipes”. These green tubes, as they are most commonly referred to in the oil country tubular goods (OCTG) industry, are intermediate or in-process pipes which require additional processing, such as threading, heat treatment or testing, before they can be used as fully finished oil and gas OCTG in end-use applications. This product definition includes green tube casing (i.e. green tubes with the necessary characteristics and intended for finishing into casing) and does not include green tube tubing.

[15] Drill pipe is excluded from the product definition for this investigation. Drill pipe consists of heavy (usually seamless) tubing with high-strength tool joints on either end that is manufactured to API specification 5DP or API specification 7-1 and is used for drilling oil and gas wells.

[16] Pup joints are also excluded from the product definition for this investigation. These products are essentially short lengths of OCTG used for spacing in a drill string, and these are excluded where their length is twelve feet or below (with a three-inch tolerance), as defined in API 5CT.

⁴ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 34-35.

[17] Unattached couplings as well as coupling stock are also excluded from the product definition for this investigation. Couplings are used to connect two pipes together, allowing for the flow of hydrocarbons and other production fluids from the reservoir to the surface. Casing and tubing couplings come in various sizes, materials, and designs, and are made from coupling stock. Coupling stock is similar to other OCTG except that the pipe walls are thicker and the coupling stock pipe itself is used for further processing into couplings or other float equipment.

[18] Insulated tubing and vacuum insulated tubing (IT/VIT) are also excluded from the product definition for this investigation. IT/VIT are a subset of OCTG that are used for thermal-enhanced oil recovery of extremely viscous crude oils. IT/VIT may also be described as insulated steam injected tubing and oil production tubing, including double-walled tubing, with or without insulation. These IT/VIT products are used in steam injection wells in Steam Assisted Gravity Drainage (SAGD) drilling applications deployed in oil sands assets and also in Cyclic Steam Stimulation (CSS) drilling applications deployed in heavy oil assets.

[19] Finally, stainless steel OCTG is excluded from the product definition for this investigation.

PRODUCT SPECIFICATIONS AND USAGE ⁵

[20] Casing is used to prevent the walls of the bored hole from collapsing, both during drilling and after the well has been completed. It must be able to withstand outside pressure and internal yield pressures within the well. In addition, it must have sufficient joint strength to hold their own weight and must be equipped with threads sufficiently tight to contain the well pressure where lengths are joined. Threading may be performed by the manufacturer or a third-party threading operation. Various factors limit the total amount of open hole that can be drilled at any one time, and it may be necessary to set more than one string of Casing concentrically for certain portions of the well depth.

[21] Heat-treated seamless casing requires steel of a particular chemistry and careful heat treatment to obtain the necessary combination of mechanical properties and/or resistance to corrosion and environmental cracking. The required characteristics could include, for example, maximum strength (P110 and Q125), high-strength with low ductility (normally proprietary enhancements of API grades), or high-strength combined with resistance to corrosion and environmental cracking (e.g. C110, T95 and proprietary enhancements).

[22] A green tube for a higher strength grade can have a chemistry that meets a lower grade like H40 or J55 that does not require heat treatment and can be tested and threaded to meet the lower grade.

[23] There are a wide range of possible proprietary enhancements that exceed API minimum requirements, including proprietary “subgrades”. Examples of proprietary subgrades include Tenaris Canada’s Improved Collapse (IC such as a P110 IC) or Improved Collapse and Yield (ICY, such as L80 ICY).

⁵ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 36-41.

PRODUCTION PROCESS⁶

[24] Casing may be by either the seamless or the electric resistance welded (ERW) process. The complainant, Tenaris Canada, employs both the seamless and the ERW processes at its Algoma manufacturing facility in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario.

[25] The seamless production process starts with its purchasing of steel bars (also known as billets) which are imported from sister companies. The steel bar is cut into a billet and then loaded into the rotary furnace to be heated and readied for the Hot Rolling Mill (HRM). Once the HRM has transformed the billet into a tube it enters into a reheat furnace and then the stretch reduction/sizing mill produces the final dimensions. Depending on the grade desired, the next process may involve heat treatment. Finishing operations include Non-Destructive Testing (NDT), electromagnetic inspection (EMI) testing, hydrotesting, thread inspection, coupling, varnishing, stenciling and railcar loading for shipment.

[26] All Casing produced by Algoma are green tubes before they are finished. While Algoma has its own threading, coupling and heat-treating capabilities, some product of Algoma is threaded, usually with a Casing premium connection (and coupling/protector applied), at the Hydril facility in Alberta. The products that are threaded at Hydril facility products are reported as sales by Algoma.

[27] Algoma currently produces seamless casing in diameters ranging from 4.5 to 9.875 inches for API and proprietary grades and well as ERW casing in diameters ranging from 4.5 to 12.75 inches.

[28] ERW Casing is produced by slitting flat hot-rolled steel in coil form of a predetermined thickness (skelp) to the proper width required to produce the desired diameter of pipe. The skelp is then sent through a series of forming rolls that bend it into a tubular shape. As the edges of the skelp come together under pressure in the final forming rolls, an electric current is passed between them. The resistance to the current heats the edges of the skelp to the welding temperature, and the weld is formed as the two edges are pressed together.

[29] Steel tubes are formed by either the seamless or the ERW methods and are then cut to length. Depending on the API specifications required, Casing may also be heat-treated at this point. The product is then sent to the finishing line where it is tested (NDT, EMI and hydro) beveled and threaded on both ends. Tubing may undergo a separate process of upsetting and normalizing prior to threading. Finally, a coupling and coupling protector are applied to one end of the Casing and a thread protector is applied to the other end before it is ready for shipment. Finishing operations also include cooling, straightening, inspection, testing, coating, and/or bundling.

⁶ OCTG6 Complaint (NC), paragraphs 42-48.

CLASSIFICATION OF IMPORTS

[30] The subject goods are normally imported under the following tariff classification numbers:

7304.29.00.12	7306.29.00.12
7304.29.00.13	7306.29.00.13
7304.29.00.14	7306.29.00.14
7304.29.00.15	7306.29.00.15
7304.29.00.16	7306.29.00.16
7304.29.00.17	7306.29.00.17
7304.29.00.19	7306.29.00.19
7304.29.00.22	7306.29.00.22
7304.29.00.23	7306.29.00.23
7304.29.00.24	7306.29.00.24
7304.29.00.25	7306.29.00.25
7304.29.00.26	7306.29.00.26
7304.29.00.27	7306.29.00.27
7304.29.00.29	7306.29.00.29

[31] The listing of tariff classification numbers is for convenience of reference only. The tariff classification numbers include non-subject goods. Also, subject goods may fall under tariff classification numbers that are not listed. Refer to the product definition for authoritative details regarding the subject goods.

LIKE GOODS AND CLASS OF GOODS⁷

[32] Subsection 2(1) of SIMA defines “like goods” in relation to any other goods as :

“... (a) goods that are identical in all respects to the other goods, or (b) in the absence of any such goods..., goods the uses and other characteristics of which closely resemble those of the other goods.”

[33] In considering the issue of like goods, the Canadian International Trade Tribunal (CITT) typically looks at a number of factors, including the physical characteristics of the goods, their market characteristics, and whether the domestic goods fulfill the same customer needs as the subject goods.

⁷ OCTG6 Complaint (NC), paragraphs 84-89.

[34] The complaint stated that the oil and gas casing covered by this complaint is a single class of goods, whether produced by the seamless or electric resistance welded (ERW) method. In support, they cited as an example, the *Seamless Casing* investigation, and subsequent expiry reviews,⁸ where the CITT found that the like goods were casing of the same size range of the subject goods. The CITT did not expand the scope of like goods beyond the scope of the subject goods to include other types of OCTG (e.g. tubing or pup joints) or larger sizes of casing (e.g. with an outer diameter of 16” or greater).

[35] The complainant confirmed that given its usage, technical requirements and lack of substitutability, tubing does not form part of the like goods to subject casing for this complaint.⁹

[36] The inclusion of green tubes was justified on the basis that they harm the domestic industry in the same way as the finished good, citing previous CITT decisions, which affirm this position in support.¹⁰

[37] For the purposes of this analysis, like goods consist of domestically produced oil and gas well casing described in the product definition.

[38] After considering questions of use, physical characteristics, and all other relevant factors, the CBSA is of the opinion that subject goods and like goods constitute only one class of goods.

THE CANADIAN INDUSTRY

DOMESTIC PRODUCERS

[39] Based on the information supplied in the complaint, the complainant identified three domestic producers of like goods in Canada, Algoma Tubes, Interpro and Welded Tube of Canada (WTC). The CBSA is not aware of any other producers of oil and gas well casing in Canada.

STANDING

[40] Pursuant to subsection 31(2) of SIMA, the following conditions must be met in order for an investigation to be initiated:

- (a) the complaint is supported by domestic producers whose production represents more than 50% of the total production of like goods by those domestic producers who express either support for or opposition to the complaint, and
- (b) the production of the domestic producers who support the complaint represents 25% or more of the total production of like goods by the domestic industry.

⁸ [SEAMLESS CARBON OR ALLOY STEEL OIL AND GAS WELL CASING - Canadian International Trade Tribunal](#), March 25, 2008, paragraph 8.

⁹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 86-87.

¹⁰ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 88-89.

[41] Subsection 31(2.1) of SIMA provides that where a domestic producer is an importer of, or is related to an exporter or importer of, allegedly dumped or subsidized goods, any such producer may be excluded from the definition of “domestic producers”, for purposes of determining the standing under subsection 31(2). Similarly, subsection 31(3) stipulates that such producers may also be excluded from the definition of “domestic industry,” for purposes of standing.

[42] Subsection 31(4) provides guidance for determining whether a domestic producer is related to an exporter or importer for purposes of standing. There are criteria for control and behavior in relation to the domestic producer and both must be satisfied in order for the domestic producer to be deemed related to either party for purposes of not being considered for standing.

[43] The criteria in respect of control states:

- (a) the producer either directly or indirectly controls, or is controlled by, the exporter or importer,
- (b) the producer and the exporter or the importer, as the case may be, are directly or indirectly controlled by a third person, or
- (c) the producer and the exporter or the importer, as the case may be, directly or indirectly control a third person,

[44] The criteria in respect of the behavior requires that there are “grounds to believe that the producer behaves differently towards the exporter or importer than does a non-related producer.”

[45] Subsection 2(1.3) of SIMA further clarifies that a person is deemed to control another person where the first person is legally or operationally in a position to exercise restraint or direction over the other person.

[46] The complainant submitted that WTC should be excluded from the domestic industry for purposes of determining standing pursuant to 31(2) of SIMA based the conditions outlined in subsection 31(4) of SIMA. Specifically, the complainant submitted evidence showing that WT USA is a wholly owned subsidiary of WTC, who legally and operationally controls this entity. The complainant has also observed that this relationship results in WTC behaving differently towards WT USA, as a related producer and exporter of oil and gas well casing, than they do towards unrelated producers and exporters.¹¹

[47] Subject exports from WT USA accounted for a substantial amount of the alleged dumped subject goods in the complaint. Consequently, it was reasonable for the President to exercise the discretion afforded under subsection 31(2.1). This is consistent with the approach taken in the recent *Oil Country Tubular Goods 5* investigation.¹² As such, for purposes of

¹¹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 102-106, 109.

¹² [Statement of reasons—Initiation of investigation: Oil Country Tubular Goods 5 \(OCTG5 2025 IN\)](#), paragraphs 45 – 55.

standing, WTC was excluded from the definition of “domestic producer” as per the aforementioned SIMA provisions.

[48] With only one other producer of like goods in Canada, Interpro, the information on the record confirmed that the complainant satisfies the requirements for standing under both paragraphs 31(2)(a) and 31(2)(b) of SIMA.¹³

THE CANADIAN MARKET

[49] Detailed information regarding the sales from domestic production cannot be divulged for confidentiality reasons. Consequently, the following focuses on imports of goods meeting the description of the subject goods.

[50] The complainant, using Statistics Canada and Global affairs data, estimated the total value of imports of subject goods and goods of the same description from all other countries from January 1, 2022 to September 30, 2025.¹⁴

[51] The CBSA conducted its own independent review of imports of certain oil and gas well casing from the CBSA’s Electronic Facility Information Retrieval Management (E-FIRM) database and the CBSA Assessment and Revenue Management (CARM) system using the tariff classification numbers under which the subject goods are imported from the subject countries and exporters/producers and all other countries. In addition, the CBSA reviewed its Accelerated Commercial Release Operations Support System (ACROSS) data to correct any errors and remove non-subject imports.

[52] The CBSA has prepared the following tables to show estimated imports of certain oil and gas well casing into Canada from January 1, 2022 to September 30, 2025. Volumes are expressed in metric tonnes (MT) and values expressed in Canadian dollars (CAD).¹⁵

¹³ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint, Exhibit VI-1: Canadian Market Table, Tab 1 (PRO).

¹⁴ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VI-1: Canadian Market Table, Tab 1 (PRO). The table is considered confidential even though cited through StatsCan and Global Affairs data because the re-exports of WTC required a deductive analysis of Interpro’s exports which comes from a Confidential source: Exhibit VII-24: Phoenix Data (PRO).

¹⁵ The United States data includes all exports, including WT USA. Since no investigation was initiated against them, they were not classified as subject goods. Goods re-exported to the US by WTC have not been netted out of US Import figures.

Table 1 ¹⁶
CBSA's Estimated Share Volume of Certain Oil and Gas Well Casing Imports (MT)

Country	2022	2023	2024	Q1-Q3 2025	POI (Q4-2024 - Q3-2025)
Subject Goods					
Austria	17%	20%	11%	11%	11%
Other Countries					
United States	25%	37%	40%	42%	44%
Mexico	7%	11%	28%	30%	28%
China	32%	17%	7%	3%	4%
Other Countries	18%	15%	14%	14%	14%
Total Import Volume	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2
**CBSA's Estimated Share Value of Certain Oil and Gas Well Casing Imports
(CAD)**

Country	2022	2023	2024	Q1-Q3 2025	POI (Q4-2024 - Q3-2025)
Subject Goods					
Austria	20%	28%	14%	13%	13%
Other Countries					
United States	22%	24%	32%	33%	35%
Mexico	10%	14%	36%	39%	37%
China	29%	17%	8%	3%	4%
Other Countries	20%	16%	11%	11%	11%
Total Import Volume	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

[53] The import data generated by the CBSA shows comparable trends to those provided by the complainant in terms of the quantity of imports and relative share of imports of subject goods in comparison to other countries.

[54] The CBSA will continue to gather and analyze information on the volume of imports during the Period of Investigation (POI) of December 1, 2024 to November 30, 2025 as part of the preliminary phase of the dumping investigation and will refine these estimates.

¹⁶ Pursuant to subsection 2(1) of SIMA, the volume of goods of a country is considered negligible if it accounts for less than 3% of the total volume of goods that are released into Canada from all countries and that are of the same description as the goods. The result of the preliminary negligibility test is provided in Table 1 and shows that the import volumes of subject goods from each of the named countries are estimated to be equal to or greater than 3% of total imports during the period reviewed, which is not considered negligible.

EVIDENCE OF DUMPING

[55] The complainant alleges that the subject goods have been dumped and that such dumping is threatening to cause material injury to the oil and gas well casing industry in Canada.

NORMAL VALUE

COMPLAINANTS' ESTIMATES OF NORMAL VALUE

[56] The complainant's allegations of dumping were based on a comparison of their estimated normal values for the allegedly dumped goods with their estimated export prices.

Section 15

[57] The complainant stated that they were unable to find any market pricing for like goods sold domestically in Austria as there is minimal consumption of casing in the country, with very low oil production.¹⁷

Section 19

[58] In absence of usable information for section 15 normal values, the complainant estimated normal values for Austria using a paragraph 19(b) constructed cost-plus profit methodology, based on the aggregate of estimates of the cost of production of the subject goods, a reasonable amount for administrative, selling, and other costs and a reasonable amount for profits.¹⁸ The costs are based on a related affiliate, Tenaris Dalmine (Italy), from average production costs over the July 2024 through June 2025 period.¹⁹

[59] Tenaris provided a cost build-up for eight seamless casing products. Their final margin of dumping calculations were based on five products.²⁰

COST OF PRODUCTION

[60] For the purposes of estimating the cost of raw materials (steel billet), the complainant used the material and transformation costs (non-labour) of Italian producer and affiliate, Tenaris Dalmine.

[61] The complainant rationalized that Tenaris Dalmine has a cost structure for seamless casing that is considered to reflect those in other competitive markets, is based in Europe and shares many of the same market characteristics and costs as the producer, Voestalpine (Voest)

¹⁷ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 133-134.

¹⁸ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-5 – Dumping Calculations, Tab 4.

¹⁹ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-5 – Dumping Calculations, Tab 4 (line 13 of Excel sheet).

²⁰ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-5 – Dumping Calculations, Tab 1.

would in Austria. Therefore, Tenaris Dalmine's costs, including materials, energy, and overhead, were used in estimating Voest's costs.²¹

[62] The complainant was able to adjust their costs to reflect the estimated higher cost of labour in Austria as compared to Italy.²²

[63] The complainant explained that as an integrated producer, Tenaris Dalmine's costs of production are its actual cost of manufacturing steel bars cut into billets, and pierced by a mandrel. Given that Voest is an integrated producer that produces its own billet,²³ Voest's billet costs are likely tied to the cost of production in the same way as that of Tenaris Dalmine.²⁴

[64] Since Tenaris Dalmine's standard costs do not track overhead associated with regular annual maintenance (but rather tracks it separately), the complainant allocated a slight upwards adjustment to their costs estimates so as to not understate costs.²⁵

[65] Tenaris also allocated an amount for scrap recovery, which varied depending on the grade of final product.²⁶

[66] The complainant submitted that labour costs in Austria are higher than Italian labour costs.²⁷ Information available from the European Union was cited, which reported that the Austrian average hourly manufacturing labour cost was higher than the Italian average hourly manufacturing labour cost.²⁸ As a result, an Austrian labour premium over Tenaris Dalmine's labour was added to Voest's labour cost of production.²⁹

[67] In addition, the complainant added an estimated additional amount of labour cost that Voest allegedly incurs.³⁰

²¹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 140.

²² Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-5 – Dumping Calculations, Tab 11 (last line).

²³ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 146; Exhibit VII-6, Voestalpine 2024-2025 Annual Report (PUBLIC) at p. 6.

²⁴ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-32, Tenaris Dalmine Steel Costs (PRO). Screenshot showing a sample of Tenaris Dalmine's steel bar costs from its electronic costing system.

²⁵ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 149; Exhibit VII-5: Dumping Calculations, Tab 11.

²⁶ Scrap recovery was combined with something called "CTT" which stands for "Charge To Thousand" (kilograms). It is the KPI for how Tenaris measures steel in vs steel out. A CTT of 1,200 might be bad (i.e. 1,200 kg of billet to make 1000 kg of pipe) while a CTT of 1,050 might be good.

²⁷ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 151.

²⁸ Exhibit 1 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-24, Eurostat, Manufacturing Labour Cost Levels.

²⁹ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-5, Dumping Calculations, at Tab 2; see also Exhibit VII-31, Tenaris Dalmine Hourly Labour Cost: Screenshot of Tenaris Dalmine's hourly labour costs from its electronic costing system.

³⁰ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 155 – 158.

GS&A AND PROFIT

[68] The complainant estimated GS&A using the most recently available public financial statements for Voest.³¹ A detailed calculation worksheet on how they arrived at this figure was provided alongside the cost build-up and normal value calculation worksheets.³² The ratio expressed as a percentage of Voest's costs was 13%.

[69] The complainant made extensive representations as to why it would not be appropriate to use Voest's financial statements to estimate its amount for profit. The complainant opted instead to use the public financial statements from two European producers that also produce seamless casing, Benteler and Vallourec.³³ The Benteler amount for profit was 6.7% and the Vallourec amount for profit was 18%. They used a simple average to arrive at 12.4% as their estimated profit for Voest.

CBSA'S ESTIMATE OF NORMAL VALUE

Section 19

[70] In the absence of home market pricing in Austria, the CBSA concurred with the complainant's approach to estimate normal values for Austria, using a constructed cost-plus method under a paragraph 19(b) methodology, on the aggregate of the cost of production of the subject goods, a reasonable amount for administrative, selling, and other costs and a reasonable amount for profits.

COST OF PRODUCTION

[71] The CBSA generally accepted the complainant's estimates of steel and transformation costs with some minor modifications.

[72] The CBSA was able to verify that the steel cost estimates (i.e. steel bar) were reasonable. Dalmine's costs were cited in part to support the estimates.³⁴ The CBSA downgraded the costs slightly, including the yield loss calculation based on its analysis of the information.³⁵

[73] Given the dated nature of what the complainant used to estimate labour differentials between Austria and Italy, the CBSA cited two sources for its labour adjustment factor, including one derived from 2025.³⁶ The result downgraded the labour factor adjustment slightly. The CBSA also reduced the estimated additional amount of labour cost that the complainant had allocated.

³¹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG Complaint; Exhibit VII-6, Voestalpine 2024-2025 Annual Report, page 352.

³² Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-5, Dumping Calculations, Tab 9.

³³ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 164-174; Exhibit VII-27, Benteler Annual Report (2024), page 130; Exhibit VII-28, Vallourec Universal Registration Document (2024), page 294.

³⁴ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-32: Dalmine Costs.

³⁵ Complaint Analysis Attachment 2: Normal Value, Export Price and Margin of Dumping Estimates.

³⁶ Complaint Analysis Attachment 2: Normal Value, Export Price and Margin of Dumping Estimates.

GS&A AND PROFIT

[74] The CBSA made no adjustment to the GS&A estimate from the complainant of 13% of costs, as it was found to be reasonable and well supported.

[75] The complainant stated in relation to determining an amount for profits that “in no case is it permissible under the law to rely on an amount for profit based on export sales.”³⁷

[76] The CBSA noted, however, that each of the two financial statements cited by the complainant also include exports and sales made by foreign affiliates abroad, including sales of OCTG.

[77] Benteler, for example, had substantial sales to the United States.³⁸ Benteler also reported a mix of welded and seamless, so it is not purely a seamless pipe producer. The report provided is also somewhat antiquated with a fiscal period ending December 31, 2024. Nonetheless, the amount for profit derived from the Benteler financial report was not unreasonably high.

[78] Vallourec also reported the majority of their revenue from OCTG,³⁹ whereby nearly half of their total tube revenue comes from North America,⁴⁰ which Vallourec states is largely the United States.⁴¹ Some of the total OCTG revenue is even generated in China, where Vallourec has an OCTG affiliate.⁴²

[79] Consequently, the information used by the complainant also includes profits derived from sales made outside of Europe and is largely consolidated to such a degree that it is not possible to segregate the data into something more closely aligned with sales of OCTG in Europe.

[80] As such, the CBSA used the most recent full-year financial statement information on the record, for Voestalpine’s Metal Engineering division, which is the division that includes tubular goods.⁴³

³⁷ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 166.

³⁸ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 164-174; Exhibit VII-27, Benteler Annual Report (2024), page 49.

³⁹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, Exhibit VII-28, Vallourec Universal Registration Document (2024), page 296.

⁴⁰ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, Exhibit VII-28, Vallourec Universal Registration Document (2024), page 296.

⁴¹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, Exhibit VII-28, Vallourec Universal Registration Document (2024), page 22.

⁴² Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, Exhibit VII-28, Vallourec Universal Registration Document (2024), page 26.

⁴³ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 168; Exhibit VII-6, Voestalpine 2024-2025 Annual Report, page 401.

[81] Using information from the actual exporter is preferable, notwithstanding stated flaws, which as noted above, will exist regardless of the source. Using the company's own financial results is consistent with the CBSA's approach in the last investigation concerning OCTG from Austria, where amounts for profit were determined under a ministerial specification.⁴⁴

[82] The resulting amount for profit for Voest for purposes of estimating normal values was 5.22%.

EXPORT PRICE

Complainants' Estimates of Export Price

[83] The export price of goods sold to an importer in Canada is generally determined in accordance with section 24 of SIMA as the lesser of the exporter's sale price for the goods and the price at which the importer has purchased or agreed to purchase the goods adjusted by deducting all costs, charges, expenses, and duties and taxes resulting from the exportation of the goods.

[84] The complainant stated that the import data from StatsCan is not sufficiently granular to distinguish between different Voest casing products.⁴⁵

[85] The complainant submitted that their best information available regarding export prices for subject goods from Voest sold in Canada during the POI⁴⁶ is from Tenaris Canada's account-specific allegations of sales lost to Voest products. Tenaris Canada cited commercial intelligence relating to quotes that it provided to purchasers for specific requests for seamless casing for which Tenaris Canada subsequently learned that the purchaser allegedly chose to purchase a Voest product instead. Tenaris Canada submitted that it has commercial intelligence as to the amount by which Voest undercut Tenaris Canada's prices. These account-specific allegations are set out in the complaint.⁴⁷

[86] The complainant's estimation of Austrian export prices begins with a price quote in the Canadian market it believes it was competing with, then backs out a distributor mark-up, intra-European freight, ocean freight from Italy to Thunder Bay and freight within Canada from Thunder Bay to Edmonton.⁴⁸

[87] The complainant cited evidence on the record to support its estimates for distributor margins and cost of delivery.⁴⁹

⁴⁴ [Oil country tubular goods 4 2021 investigations—Statement of Reasons—final determination](#), paragraph 76.

⁴⁵ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 202.

⁴⁶ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 32 (October 1, 2024 to September 30, 2025).

⁴⁷ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 203; Exhibit VII-5: Dumping Calculations at Tab 8 (PRO).

⁴⁸ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-5: Dumping Calculations at Tab 6 (PRO).

⁴⁹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, Exhibit VII-11: StatsCan Annual Wholesale Trade Survey (AWTS) for Metal Service Centres 2023. Note: The CBSA noted the release date of this information was December 2024 and is based on 2023 data; Exhibit VII-16: Austria Port Imports of Seamless Casing (2024-2025).

CBSA's Estimates of Export Price

[88] In order to estimate export prices, the CBSA relied on information available through E-FIRM, for the period of October 1, 2024 to September 30, 2025. The CBSA reviewed customs data for goods imported within the tariff classification numbers under which subject goods are imported.

[89] For all subject goods, the CBSA estimated exports prices in accordance with section 24 of SIMA based on the import data available. The descriptive data currently available through E-FIRM provided sufficient detail to enable the CBSA to calculate export prices at a more granular product level, than what was available to the complainant working only with harmonized classification codes.

ESTIMATED MARGINS OF DUMPING

[90] For the purposes of the initiation of the investigation, the CBSA has estimated a margin of dumping using normal values based on the methodology of paragraph 19(b) of SIMA for subject imports from Austria, as explained above.

[91] Based on the normal values estimated under paragraph 19(b), the CBSA estimated the margin of dumping for subject goods from Austria by comparing the estimated normal values with the estimated export prices for the period of October 1, 2024 to September 30, 2025. The CBSA estimates that subject goods from Austria were dumped by a weighted average margin of 9.0%, expressed as a percentage of the export price.

EVIDENCE OF THREAT OF INJURY

[92] The complainant alleged that the subject goods have been dumped and that such dumping is threatening to cause material injury to the oil and gas well casing industry in Canada. The complaint does not allege material injury has already occurred, only that if the present circumstances continue, they will incur material injury.⁵⁰

[93] There is no legislated timeline in assessing threat of injury. The CITT has provided its own guideline for assessing threat of injury in past cases as follows:

“ the Tribunal typically considers a time frame of 12 to 18 months, and no more than 24 months, beyond the date of its finding. The Tribunal is not necessarily bound by this time frame, as each case is unique.”⁵¹

⁵⁰ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 212-214.

⁵¹ [SILICON METAL - Canadian International Trade Tribunal](#), NQ-2013-003, paragraph 154.

[94] The complainant cautioned against looking only at what has occurred in the market recently and to look forward to the future impact:

“The Tribunal may find threat of injury even when subject goods did not gain sales volume or market share over the POI, or when there was no significant increase of dumped goods in absolute or relative terms, and similarly when the percentage share of imports declined over the POI.”⁵²

[95] The CBSA notes that the threat of injury as defined in SIMA states:

“For the purposes of this Act, the dumping or subsidizing of goods shall not be found to be threatening to cause injury or to cause a threat of injury unless the circumstances in which the dumping or subsidizing of goods would cause injury are clearly foreseen and imminent.”⁵³

[96] To be “clearly foreseen and imminent” there must be reliable evidence that would draw a causal link between the dumping and future injury, such that there is a reasonable indication this will occur. As such, information relied upon in support cannot rest primarily on speculation on what *could* occur. The words “clearly foreseen and imminent” hold significant meaning in this regard.

[97] In support of its allegations, the complainant provided account specific allegations that they believe provide evidence of:

- lost sales;
- price undercutting;
- lost revenue;
- lost volumes; and
- downward pressure on prices⁵⁴

[98] Beyond the account specific allegations, the complainant made a number of key arguments surrounding the threat of injury, which are repeated throughout the complaint. The CBSA has consolidated these into their general topics and provided an overview of the analysis of them below. These allegations for threat of injury can be summarized as:

- Subject imports are undercutting pricing in Canada;
- Subject imports volumes are increasingly being diverted from US to Canada;
- Subject imports threaten Tenaris’s market share; and
- Subject imports threaten Tenaris’s profitability and development and investments

⁵² Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 216.

⁵³ SIMA section 2(1.5).

⁵⁴ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 289 and 290.

PRICE UNDERCUTTING

[99] Tenaris stated that “prices of Subject Goods from Austria have fallen rapidly since 2024 and there is material threat of further drops in pricing.”⁵⁵

[100] The complainant argued that the allegedly dumped goods have undercut the prices of like goods, leading to lost sales volumes and revenues for the domestic industry. To support this allegation, the complainant provided analysis of average unit values from the period spanning 2023 to Q3-2025, while acknowledging the challenges of aggregate analyses due to product mix variations in OCTG (i.e. grades, diameters, end-finishes, etc.).⁵⁶

[101] Tenaris stated in regards to Austria that “import prices are falling, and falling faster than the rest of the market, including Tenaris Canada’s domestic selling prices and market prices generally.”⁵⁷

[102] Additional analysis submitted by the complainant focuses on the apparent decline in average pricing of seamless casing from Austria.

Table 3
Austrian Casing Analysis

Month ⁵⁸	Austrian Casing, 4.5-7” ⁵⁹
June 2024	\$3,234
August 2024	\$3,303
September 2024	\$3,002
November 2024	\$3,001
December 2024	\$2,812
April 2025	\$2,728
May 2025	\$2,703
June 2025	\$2,474
July 2025	\$2,924
August 2025	\$2,871
September 2025	\$2,824
October 2025	\$2,704
<u>Decrease over period</u>	<u>-\$530</u>

⁵⁵ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 304.

⁵⁶ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 9, Table 1; Exhibit VI-1, Casing Market Table 2022-2025; Exhibit VII-25, Tenaris Canada Income Statement (2022-Sept 2025).

⁵⁷ Exhibit 1 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 9.

⁵⁸ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VIII-25, GAC Import Permit Data, excluding months without imports from both sources.

⁵⁹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VIII-25, GAC Steel Import Data for 4.5" to 7" Seamless Casing 2024-2025 YTD (NC).

[103] The complainant summarized the undercutting from Voest by stating:

“Tenaris Canada’s ability to meet this growth opportunity is being undermined by unfairly traded Austrian imports. Austrian heat-treated seamless Casing (such as L80, P110 and T95) competes directly with Tenaris Canada’s high-end seamless grades, including its L80, P110 and TN110S and TN110SS. Voest’s undercutting has forced Tenaris Canada to reduce its own prices to retain customers, slashing margins and undermining the return on major investments in domestic heat-treated seamless production. If dumped goods are allowed to continue unchecked, Canadian production will be pushed aside or rendered unprofitable in its own market.”⁶⁰

[104] The complainant also cited publicly available statistics to emphasize the decline in pricing from Austria relative to other export sources.

Table 4⁶¹
Average Unit Values(CAD/MT) of Imports of Seamless Casing from Major Markets⁶²

SOURCE	2023	2024	2025(Jan-Sep)
Austria	3,785.66	3,100.67	2,747.93
China	2,833.14	2,632.12	2,492.75
Mexico	3,432.97	3,213.08	3,118.08
United States	2,788.37	3,000.65	3,236.92
Year-To-Year % Change			
Austria		-18%	-11%
China		-7%	-5%
Mexico		-6%	-3%
United States		8%	8%

[105] While the Austrian decline has been greater than China’s, it is still well above those prices and China has very little current presence in the Canadian OCTG market. Furthermore, the Mexican prices are not at arm’s length⁶³ and changes in product mix can explain some of the movements in prices from the United States and Austria. The complainant conceded that the data does not lend itself well to isolate product mix.⁶⁴

[106] The complainant made numerous other arguments concerning the decline in Austrian pricing relative to other sources, citing data which was largely redundant to the information above.⁶⁵

⁶⁰ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 16.

⁶¹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 305, Table 6.

⁶² Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint, Exhibit VIII-24, 2023-2025 YTD Casing Import Data (StatsCan + GAC Data) (PUBLIC), Tab titled “Total Summary”.

⁶³ [Statement of reasons—Initiation of investigation: Oil Country Tubular Goods 5 \(OCTG5 2025 IN\)](#), paragraph 43.

⁶⁴ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 307.

⁶⁵ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 310-315.

[107] The CBSA's analysis of selling prices from Austria was more nuanced, able to identify where product mix may have changed over time, leading to the differences seen in aggregate pricing changes. This information cannot be disclosed due to the protected nature of the data.

[108] Based on the CBSA's estimates and analysis of selling prices, the CBSA finds that the data provides a reasonable indication that the allegedly dumped subject goods threaten injury to the domestic industry in the form of price undercutting.

LIKELY INCREASE IN VOLUME ON DIVERSION FROM UNITED STATES

[109] On March 12, 2025, the United States imposed duties under Section 232 of the US *Trade Expansion Act of 1962* (“**Section 232**”), which authorize the President of the United States to restrict imports on national security grounds.⁶⁶ This initially imposed a global tariff on steel and aluminum of 25%. On June 4, 2025, tariffs on steel and aluminum increased to 50%.

[110] The complainant made frequent references to the imposition of these duties causing a clear diversionary effect on subject goods.

[111] The complainant cited recent determinations from the CITT in support of this position:

“The Tribunal has already ruled, in the past months, including in the *Steel Strapping* preliminary injury determination, that the US Section 232 tariff creates a reasonable indication of threat of injury due to the diversion of steel into the United States.”⁶⁷

[112] These comments arose in the preliminary injury determination regarding *Steel Strapping* in July 2025. Shortly thereafter, Canada imposed its own tariff rate quota (TRQ),⁶⁸ which has potentially significant ramifications.

[113] Consequently, while significant portions of the complaint spoke of diversion of goods due to US duties,⁶⁹ appropriate context around the imposition of the TRQ in respect of Austria is merited.

[114] Austria falls under the listing of Free Trade Agreement (FTA) countries, which excludes CUSMA partners.⁷⁰

[115] According to the original Order in Council, there was a transitional period of August 1 to September 25, 2025. This is the “Q1” period. That limit on OCTG imports was 8,042 MT. The Order stated that no surtax is payable if this quota is not surpassed. Usage of the quota is updated regularly through Global Affairs Canada.⁷¹

⁶⁶ Exhibit 1 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 3.

⁶⁷ Exhibit 1 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 233; 353.

⁶⁸ Exhibit 1 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 382.

⁶⁹ Exhibit 1 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 222, 223 and 325.

⁷⁰ [Orders In Council - Search](#)

⁷¹ [Steel: Tariff rate quota \(TRQ\) utilization data quarterly reports](#)

[116] For the “Q1” period limit of 8,042 MT, Austria accounted for 3,590 MT, which is only 44.64% of the quota. These results run counter to the speculation that they may exceed the quota.

[117] This was also reflected in the “Q2” period, where the quota was 13,068 MT and ran from September 26 through December 25, 2025.⁷² In that period, Austria used only 44% of the OCTG quota at 5,741 MT. The maximum volume they could have exported in this quarter was 11,238 MT, which is 86% of 13,068 MT. Other countries accounted for over 47% of the quota.

[118] On November 26, 2025, Canada announced a reduction in the quota from 100% of 2024 levels, to 75% of 2024 levels. That means instead of the quarterly limit on OCTG being 13,068 MT, it will now be 9,801 MT for “Q3”.⁷³ The single country maximum will lower to 8,429 MT.⁷⁴

[119] The current “Q3” period runs through March 25, 2026. As of January 15, 2026, 23% of the quota has been used, none by Austria.⁷⁵

[120] The complainant also provided data citing Austria’s share of exports to other countries, demonstrating that Canada was the third largest export destination for its OCTG in 2024, behind the United States and Saudi Arabia.⁷⁶ Although the complaint stated that the volumes to Saudi Arabia were anomalous due to a particular project in 2024, the UN Comtrade historical data demonstrated that Austria has shipped even larger quantities than what was reported in 2024 going back to 2013-2014.⁷⁷

[121] Based on the CBSA’s estimates and analysis of import volumes, the CBSA finds that an increase in volume of subject goods is unlikely, in large part due to the presence of the TRQ.

MARKET SHARE

[122] The complainant alleged the injurious dumping, particularly from Austria was “an extremely aggressive pricing strategy designed to capture market share in the long-term.”⁷⁸ The complaint further alleged that “Canada is the largest accessible market for oil and gas well casing and Voest has worked to gain market share and take sales using unfair prices.”⁷⁹

[123] However, the complainant’s analysis of the Canadian market reflects Austria holding a diminishing presence, through Q3-2025, which is less than half the share they had in 2023.

⁷² [Steel: Tariff rate quota \(TRQ\) utilization data quarterly reports](#)

⁷³ [Prime Minister Carney announces new measures to protect and transform Canada’s steel and lumber industries | Prime Minister of Canada](#)

⁷⁴ 86% of 9,801 MT.

⁷⁵ [Steel: Tariff rate quota \(TRQ\) utilization data quarterly reports](#)

⁷⁶ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 345; Table 11; Exhibit IV-6, Austria OCTG Export Data (2022-2024).

⁷⁷ [UN Comtrade](#)

⁷⁸ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 298.

⁷⁹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 346.

Meanwhile, Tenaris has grown its market share over the same period.⁸⁰ The specific figures related to market share cannot be divulged for confidentiality reasons.

[124] As such, the evidence does not disclose a threat of increased tonnage from Austria, even before the TRQ went into effect.

[125] The complainant also provided projections for Canada's oil drilling to support its position that Canada will remain a strong export destination, resulting in further loss of market share. Much of the support for this position was, however, based on dated information.⁸¹

[126] More recent information, for example, indicated that oil patch drilling has slowed as oil prices have sagged and "is expected to slide further in 2026."⁸²

[127] Other projections stated that the "benchmark North American crude blend known as West Texas Intermediate, or WTI, is currently priced below \$60 US, and the U.S. Energy Information Administration projects prices will decline to an average of \$55 US in 2026. Projections vary, but others see prices headed even lower in 2027."⁸³

[128] For comparison sake, the price of a barrel of WTI oil was as high as \$116 US in 2022, averaging \$95 US for the year.⁸⁴ Consequently, OCTG demand and pricing was more robust at that time.

[129] Based on the CBSA's estimates and analysis of the Canadian market, the CBSA finds that while an increase in market share is unlikely, a continued presence of Austrian oil and gas well casing in the market is likely, providing a reasonable indication that the alleged dumped subject goods will threaten injury to the domestic industry in the form of lost market share.

ADVERSE IMPACT ON FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE AND PROFITABILITY

[130] The complainant alleged that the result of factors like price undercutting, suppression⁸⁵ and increased imports via diversion from the US⁸⁶ are that the dumped goods threaten to have an adverse impact on the complainant's financial performance and profitability.

[131] The complainant made extensive arguments that "the marketplace has devolved into a pricing war that has led to a price spiral. Dumped goods from Austria have been a leading cause of this spiral."⁸⁷ Evidence provided in the complaint demonstrated little change in

⁸⁰ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VI-1: Canadian Market Table 2022-2025.

⁸¹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VIII-2, CAOEC releases 2024/25 Drilling and Service Rig Forecast (November 29, 2024).

⁸² CBSA Complaint Analysis Attachment 5 – CBSA Research: [Oilpatch drilling slows as oil and natural gas prices sink | CBC News.](#)

⁸³ CBSA Complaint Analysis Attachment 5 – CBSA Research: [Don't expect oilpatch investment to flood in overnight after 'grand bargain,' experts say | CBC News.](#)

⁸⁴ [Crude Oil - Price - Chart - Historical Data - News; West Texas Intermediate oil price annually 1976-2025 | Statista.](#)

⁸⁵ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 225, 295.

⁸⁶ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 397, 415.

⁸⁷ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 297.

financial performance over the five quarters running from Q4-2024 through Q3-2025, although this performance is substantially lower than in 2022 and 2023.⁸⁸

[132] Based on the information contained in the complaint, as well as in its own analysis, the CBSA finds that there is a reasonable indication that the alleged dumped subject goods threaten injury to the domestic industry in the form of an impaired financial performance.

NEGATIVE EFFECTS ON EXISTING DEVELOPMENT AND INVESTMENTS

[133] The complainant alleged that their investments are at risk of unfairly priced imports from Austria. They cited several examples of planned investments, which they said are contingent on a fair competitive environment for casing in Canada.⁸⁹

[134] Numerous examples of these investments were detailed in the complaint, which can be categorized as those geared towards improving capacity, efficiency and product range and those aimed at improving infrastructure.⁹⁰

[135] Tenaris provided substantial planned investment figures, divided roughly between seamless and ERW production in Canada.⁹¹

[136] Based on the information contained in the complaint, as well as the CBSA's analysis, the CBSA finds that there is a reasonable indication that the alleged dumped subject goods threaten injury to the domestic industry in the form of a reduction to the return on investment, including the recent investments to produce grade T95 in Canada.

THREAT OF INJURY CONCLUSION

[137] Overall, based on the evidence provided in the complaint and supplementary data available to the CBSA through its own research, the CBSA finds that the evidence discloses a reasonable indication that the dumping of the subject goods from Austria is threatening to cause injury to the oil and gas well casing industry in Canada in the form of:

- Price undercutting;
- Loss of market share and sales volumes;
- Adverse impact on financial performance and profitability; and
- Negative effects on existing development and investments

[138] The standard for threat of injury under SIMA is that it must be clearly foreseen and imminent.⁹² The threat of injury in relation to subject goods from Austria rests largely with the projected production of T95 seamless casing in Canada, which was not produced in Canada during the period of analysis. Tenaris has provided credible evidence that production

⁸⁸ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint; Exhibit VII-25: Tenaris Canada Income Statement.

⁸⁹ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraphs 407-408.

⁹⁰ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 409.

⁹¹ Exhibit 1 (PRO) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 410, Figure 10.

⁹² SIMA section 2(1.5) “Threat of Injury.”

of a proprietary T95 in Canada is imminent.⁹³

CAUSAL LINK - DUMPING AND THREAT OF INJURY

[139] The CBSA finds that the complainant has sufficiently linked the threat of injury to the alleged dumping.

[140] In summary, the CBSA is of the opinion that the information provided in the complaint has disclosed a reasonable indication that the alleged dumping from Austria is threatening to cause injury to the Canadian domestic industry.

SCOPE OF THE INVESTIGATION

[141] The CBSA is conducting an investigation to determine whether the subject goods have been dumped.

[142] The CBSA has requested information from all potential exporters and importers to determine whether or not subject goods imported into Canada during the POI of December 1, 2025 to November 30, 2025 were dumped. The information requested will be used to determine the normal values, export prices and margins of dumping, if any.

[143] All parties have been clearly advised of the CBSA's information requirements and the time frames for providing their responses.

FUTURE ACTION

[144] The CITT will conduct a preliminary inquiry to determine whether the evidence discloses a reasonable indication that the alleged dumping of the goods has caused or is threatening to cause injury to the Canadian industry. The CITT must make its decision on or before the 60th day after the date of the initiation of the investigation. If the CITT concludes that the evidence does not disclose a reasonable indication of injury to the Canadian industry, the investigation will be terminated.

[145] If the CITT finds that the evidence discloses a reasonable indication of injury to the Canadian industry and the CBSA's preliminary investigation reveals that the goods have been dumped, the CBSA will make a preliminary determination of within 90 days after the date of the initiation of the investigation, by May 4, 2026. Where circumstances warrant, this period may be extended to 135 days from the date of the initiation of the investigation.

[146] Under section 35 of SIMA, if, at any time before making a preliminary determination, the CBSA is satisfied that the volume of goods of a country is negligible, the investigation will be terminated with respect to goods of that country.

⁹³ Exhibit 2 (NC) – OCTG6 Complaint, paragraph 247. T95-EY is the Tenaris grade.

[147] Imports of subject goods released by the CBSA on and after the date of a preliminary determination of dumping, other than goods of the same description as goods in respect of which a determination was made that the margin of dumping of the goods is insignificant, may be subject to provisional duty in an amount not greater than the estimated margin of dumping on the imported goods.

[148] Should the CBSA make a preliminary determination of dumping, the investigation will be continued for the purpose of making a final decision within 90 days after the date of the preliminary determination.

[149] After the preliminary determination, if, in respect of goods of a particular exporter, the CBSA's investigation reveals that imports of the subject goods from that exporter have not been dumped, or that the margin of dumping is insignificant, the investigation will be terminated in respect of those goods.

[150] If a final determination of dumping is made, the CITT will continue its inquiry and hold public hearings into the question of material injury to the Canadian industry. The CITT is required to make a finding with respect to the goods to which the final determination of dumping apply, not later than 120 days after the CBSA's preliminary determination.

[151] In the event of an injury finding by the CITT, imports of subject goods released by the CBSA after that date will be subject to anti-dumping duty equal to the applicable margin of dumping on the imported goods.

RETROACTIVE DUTY ON MASSIVE IMPORTATIONS

[152] When the CITT conducts an inquiry concerning injury to the Canadian industry, it may consider if dumped goods that were imported close to or after the initiation of the investigation constitute massive importations over a relatively short period of time and have caused injury to the Canadian industry.

[153] Should the CITT issue such a finding, anti-dumping duties may be imposed retroactively on subject goods imported into Canada and released by the CBSA during the period of 90 days preceding the day of the CBSA making preliminary determination of dumping.

UNDERTAKINGS

[154] After a preliminary determination of dumping by the CBSA, other than a preliminary determination in which a determination was made that the margin of dumping of the goods is insignificant, an exporter may submit a written undertaking to revise selling prices to Canada so that the margin of dumping or the injury caused by the dumping is eliminated.

[155] An acceptable undertaking must account for all or substantially all of the exports to Canada of the dumped goods. Interested parties may provide comments regarding the acceptability of undertakings within nine days of the receipt of an undertaking by the CBSA. The CBSA will maintain a list of parties who wish to be notified should an undertaking proposal be received. Those who are interested in being notified should provide their name, telephone number, mailing address and email address to the email identified in the “Contact us” section of this document.

[156] If an undertaking were to be accepted, the investigation and the collection of provisional duties would be suspended. Notwithstanding the acceptance of an undertaking, an exporter may request that the CBSA’s investigation be completed and that the CITT complete its injury inquiry.

PUBLICATION

[157] Notice of the initiation of this investigation is being published in the Canada Gazette pursuant to subparagraph 34(1)(a)(ii) of SIMA.

CONTACT US

[158] Interested parties are invited to file written submissions presenting facts, arguments, and evidence that they feel are relevant to the alleged dumping. Written submissions must be filed through the CBSA’s [ACE web application](#).

[159] To be given consideration in this investigation, all information should be received by the CBSA by June 12, 2026 at noon.

[160] Any information submitted to the CBSA by interested parties concerning this investigation is considered to be public information unless clearly marked “confidential”. Where the submission by an interested party is confidential, a non-confidential version of the submission must be provided at the same time. This non-confidential version will be made available to other interested parties upon request.

[161] Confidential information submitted to the CBSA will be disclosed on written request to independent counsel for parties to these proceedings, subject to conditions to protect the confidentiality of the information. Confidential information may also be released to the CITT, any court in Canada, or a WTO or Canada-United States-Mexico Agreement (CUSMA) dispute settlement panel. Additional information respecting the CBSA’s policy on the disclosure of information under SIMA may be obtained by contacting the SIMA Registry and Disclosure Unit identified below or by visiting the CBSA’s website.

[162] The schedule of the investigation and a complete listing of all exhibits and information are available at: www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/sima-lmsi/i-e/menu-eng.html. The exhibit listing will be updated as new exhibits and information are made available. This *Statement of Reasons* is available through the CBSA's website at the address below. For further information, please contact the SIMA Registry and Disclosure Unit as follows:

Email: simaregistry-depotlmsi@cbsa-asfc.gc.ca

Website: www.cbsa-asfc.gc.ca/sima-lmsi

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sean Borg', with a stylized, cursive script.

Sean Borg
A/Executive Director
Trade and Anti-dumping Programs Directorate