FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS

TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 15 of 24 July 2015

- **WTO Members discuss Ecuador's controversial safeguard measures**
- **The EU amends its list of imported goods benefiting from duty suspensions and tariff quotas**
- ***'GMO-free'* claims on the rise in EU Member States**
- **Recently Adopted EU Legislation**

WTO Members discuss Ecuador's controversial safeguard measures

On 29 June 2015, WTO Members discussed for the first time the controversial safeguard measures imposed by Ecuador for balance of payment purposes. While a number of countries expressed concerns over Ecuador's measures, WTO Members agreed to resume consultations on this matter in September.

As of 11 March 2015, Ecuador applies temporary safeguard measures for balance-of-payment purposes in the form of *ad valorem* tariff surcharges ranging from 5% to 45%, on approximately 39% of its tariff lines. Tariff lines covered by the measures include a range of sectors, such as live animals and animal products, fresh fruits, processed foodstuffs, alcoholic beverages, plastics, textiles and apparel, footwear, electrical machinery and transport equipment, *inter alia*. The trade restrictive measures are applied with respect to imports from all sources, with the exception of Bolivia and Paraguay, inasmuch as these are considered less-developed countries of the Latin American Integration Association in light of *Resolución 70* of the Committee of Representatives of the Latin American Integration Association (ALADI). Ecuador's controversial measures were notified to the WTO on 2 April 2015 (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 8 of 17 April 2015).

The WTO allows its Members, in the presence of certain requirements, to apply safeguard measures in the form of tariff surcharges or quantitative restrictions when experiencing balance-of-payment difficulties. In applying its measures, Ecuador has availed itself of the procedures under Article XVIII:B of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter, GATT), which provides the basic rules for the adoption of balance-of-payments restrictions by developing country Members of the WTO. In particular, Article XVIII:B of the GATT allows developing countries to control the level or value of their imports in order to safeguard their external financial position and to ensure the availability of a level of monetary reserves adequate for the implementation of their economic development programmes. However, the relevant GATT provisions also require that such import restrictions do not exceed those necessary: (i) to forestall the threat of, or to stop, a serious decline in its monetary reserves; or (ii) in the case of a WTO Member with inadequate monetary reserves, to achieve a reasonable rate of increase in its reserves. The GATT also requires that measures imposed for balance-of-payment purposes be non-discriminatory. The legal framework is completed by the WTO *Understanding on the Balance-of-Payments Provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994* (hereinafter, the Understanding), which clarifies the requirements for the application of safeguard measures and sets out the procedure to be followed when safeguard measures are adopted. *Inter alia*, the Understanding requires that measures taken for balance-of-payment purposes be notified and discussed within the context of the WTO

Committee on Balance-of-Payments Restrictions (hereinafter, WTO BoP Committee). The aim of these consultations is to review the measures and evaluate the presence of the requirements that should warrant their application. In this context, consultations also involve a report from the International Monetary Fund (hereinafter, IMF).

In its notification, Ecuador maintained that recourse to this mechanism was sought to "*rapidly offset the negative balance of payments and the decrease in the liquidity of the Ecuadorian economy*", which Ecuador considers affected by factors such as: (i) the fall in international prices of oil and other commodities; (ii) the decline of the remittances from Ecuadorian residents abroad; (iii) the appreciation of the US dollar (which is legal tender in Ecuador); and (vi) the devaluation of the national currencies of neighbouring countries. Ecuador provided further background on the economic justification of its measures in the "*Basic Document supplied by Ecuador*" circulated within the WTO BoP Committee for purposes of the consultations. In its submissions to the WTO BoP Committee, Ecuador maintained that Article XVIII:B of the GATT allows WTO Members to adopt measures to safeguard their external financial position and to ensure an adequate level of reserves (which, Ecuador said, in its situation of a dollarized economy, means maintaining a sufficient level of liquidity) for the implementation of its economic development. On this basis, Ecuador stated that it had activated the mechanism under Article XVIII:B of the GATT to regulate the level of imports and rectify the external sector imbalance and the liquidity situation in its economy. According to Ecuador, its measures are the remedy of last resort to "*forestall any further deterioration in the country's balance-of-payments situation*" and restore equilibrium of its balance of payments.

To comply with the requirements of the WTO, Ecuador must ensure that its import restrictions do not exceed those necessary to forestall the threat of, or to stop, a "*serious decline*" in its monetary reserves, or to achieve a reasonable rate of increase in its reserves, should it claim that its reserves are "*inadequate*". In addition, the economic conditions affecting Ecuador's balance-of-payment situation and allegedly warranting the implementation of tariff surcharges must be carefully assessed. At the WTO BoP Committee meeting, the IMF reportedly recognised Ecuador's difficulties, including the sharp drop in oil prices in late 2014 that affected Ecuador's economy. However, it also indicated that Ecuador's problems are not entirely due to external factors, and it referred to the structural adjustment measures that Ecuador committed to adopt following recommendations by the IMF Board in 2014.

Ecuador must also ensure that its measures are non-discriminatory and are not applied with a (disguised) protectionist intent. The issue is whether Ecuador could have resorted to other policies, rather than applying tariff surcharges, in order to address its balance-of-payments situation. In this respect, Ecuador's over-reliance on trade restrictions in recent years, including balance-of-payments restrictions in 2009 (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 12 of 19 June 2009), stands as an indication that protectionist reasons may have directed the Government in the choice of the measure to be applied to face alleged liquidity difficulties. Ecuador's protectionist intent in relation to some or all of the imports targeted by the surcharges could also be argued on the basis of the choices operated by the Government in selecting the products to be targeted by its safeguard measures and in modulating the extent of the duty surcharges.

A background document prepared by the WTO highlighted that, in terms of share of value of trade per category, the product categories mostly affected by the measure are: clothing; and beverages, spirits and tobacco (with the safeguard measures affecting 100% of the value of imports of these product categories), followed by dairy products (88.9%), sugars and confectionary (85.7%), fruits, vegetable and plants (84%), textiles (70%), leather, rubber and footwear (61.9%). In the course of the WTO BoP Committee meeting, several WTO Members claimed that the safeguard measures are causing a burden to their exporters and urged Ecuador to remove them as soon as possible. They also urged Ecuador to implement economic reforms and to remain consistent with WTO rules, while looking for less trade-

distortive measures. Concerns *vis-à-vis* Ecuador's measures were also expressed by a number of WTO Members within the meeting of the WTO Council for Trade in Goods, which took place a few days before the WTO BoP Committee meeting. In its submissions Ecuador maintained that the tariff surcharges were set by analysing elasticities and in a manner that accords priority to imports of certain categories of goods which are "*more essential in an economic situation where there is a sizeable balance-of-payments disequilibrium, based on the economic development policy*". Accordingly, the highest surcharges were set for mass consumption products and for consumer goods deemed by the Government to be non-essential in the country's current economic situation. As a result, some of the highest rates have been placed on goods that are also domestically produced (*e.g.*, agricultural products) or for which there is likely to be a substitution effect (*e.g.*, clothing). However, such discretionary, targeted and selective application of the safeguard measure is starting to raise concerns as to Ecuador's intent, as it happened back in 2009-2010. In addition, the exception for imports from Bolivia and Paraguay is also likely to violate the non-discrimination obligation.

WTO rules require Ecuador to progressively relax the BoP import surcharges as conditions improve and to eliminate them when the conditions no longer justify their maintenance. This commitment has been confirmed by Ecuador, which, in its notification, undertook to announce as soon as possible the time schedule for the removal of the measures. So far, Ecuador has not provided any information of the timetable for the removal of its measures.

WTO Members agreed to resume consultations on this matter in September. In that context, the IMF is likely to deliver another statement with respect to Ecuador's economic and financial situation. It is important that Ecuador's measures be properly scrutinised and that all instruments are activated bilaterally and multilaterally at the WTO so as to ensure that Ecuador's safeguard measures are removed as soon as possible. Several important sectors are targeted and, despite Ecuador being a relatively small market, the conditions of stable and continued access to its market are essential for many exporters and traders to continue enjoying the commercial opportunities that they are entitled to and invested resources to achieve. There is also a worrying systemic rationale for WTO Members to ensure that Ecuador does not take advantage of the balance-of-payments safeguards and does not discriminate or unfairly protect its domestic industry in the process: balance-of-payments safeguards cannot become the convenient shelter for countries to deviate from their WTO obligations and commitments. The indications are that the months to come will see heated discussions within the WTO BoP Committee and may even result in WTO dispute settlement procedures being activated against Ecuador.

The EU amends its list of imported goods benefiting from duty suspensions and tariff quotas

On 25 June 2015, the EU published two new Council Regulations that amend the lists of products imported into the EU benefiting from duty suspensions and tariff quotas. Products included in the lists (*i.e.*, Annexes) contained within the relevant EU Regulations (*i.e.*, *Regulation (EU) No. 1387/2013 suspending the autonomous Common Customs Tariff duties on certain agricultural and industrial products*, as amended, and *Regulation (EU) No. 1388/2013 opening and providing for the management of autonomous tariff quotas of the Union for certain agricultural and industrial products*, as amended) are allowed to enter the EU market duty free (*i.e.*, total suspension) or at reduced duty rate levels (*i.e.*, partial suspension), and either in an unlimited quantity (*i.e.*, duty suspension) or a limited quantity (*i.e.*, through the establishment of a tariff rate quota). The most recent amendments to the EU framework for duty suspensions and tariff quotas also added key language that limits the application of such benefits.

In general, duty suspensions and tariff quotas granted under this procedure are intended to stimulate the EU market by lowering the cost of raw materials, semi-finished goods or components that are not available (or not sufficiently available) in the EU, but which are needed by EU manufacturers to produce finished products. The intended benefits include improving the efficiency and competitiveness of EU industries, and to assist companies established in the EU to maintain or create employment and to modernise their structures. To accomplish these objectives, there are a number of requirements that applicants must meet before a duty suspension or tariff quota may be approved. Typically, duty suspensions and tariff quotas will not be granted if identical, equivalent or substitute products are manufactured in sufficient quantities in the EU. Moreover, the relevant product should also not be available in any country with which the EU has a preferential trading agreement (*e.g.*, a free trade agreement or, if the exporting country benefits from the EU's Generalised System of Preferences, the GSP scheme). The imported goods must be an integral part of the final product, and thus cannot be intended for sale to end-consumers and must require further substantial processing. In addition, the imported goods concerned cannot be covered by an exclusive trading agreement or traded between parties with exclusive intellectual property rights in the goods. These two requirements are aimed at ensuring that tariff suspensions are available to all EU importers and third-country suppliers. Applicants must also indicate that they have made recent genuine, though unsuccessful, attempts to obtain the goods in the EU. Lastly, the requested duty suspension must result in at least a EUR 15,000 savings per year for the applicant.

In accordance with Article 31 of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union, the EU Council may approve suspension arrangements proposed by the EU Commission. Most recently, on 25 July 2015, the EU published *Council Regulation (EU) 2015/982 of 23 June 2015 amending Regulation (EU) No. 1387/2013 suspending the autonomous Common Customs Tariff duties on certain agricultural and industrial products* (hereinafter, Council Regulation (EU) 2015/982), which applies to duty suspensions, and *Council Regulation (EU) 2015/981 of 23 June 2015 amending Regulation (EU) No. 1388/2013 opening and providing for the management of autonomous tariff quotas of the Union for certain agricultural and industrial products* (hereinafter, Council Regulation (EU) 2015/981), which applies to tariff quotas. For the most part, the amendments entered into effect on 1 July 2015. In general, once a duty suspension or tariff quota is approved by the EU Council, the benefits are not limited to the original applicant, but extended to all importers on products from all origins. On this note, quotas are also applied on a '*first-come first-served*' basis and there may occasionally be end-use restrictions. With respect to duty suspensions, Regulation (EU) 2015/982 adds 111 products to its Annex, including, *inter alia*, numerous chemical substances, camera manufacturing equipment, various components used in vehicles, lithium-ion rechargeable batteries, fruit concentrate, coconut water, fuel feedstock and film materials. The regulation also removed 15 products from its list and updated the language used in 27 product descriptions. With respect to tariff quotas, Council Regulation (EU) 2015/981 adds 7 chemical products to the list of tariff lines subject to a tariff quota, and amends 8 quotas for other products (*i.e.*, sweet cherries, various chemical substances, certain aluminium products and a type of electric AC motor). The two amendments also include language that clarifies that the suspensions listed in their annexes do "*not apply to any mixtures, preparations or products made up of different components containing products listed*".

Duty suspensions and tariff quotas are a manageable option for businesses seeking to lower costs. A study published by the EU Commission in 2013 found that, on average, between 2007 and 2011, the value of imports under suspension was EUR 18.4 billion per annum, while the average value of foregone revenue at EUR 944 million per annum. The EU Commission accepts applications for duty suspensions or tariff quotas by 15 March or 15 September of each year. However, these requests must be submitted to the EU Commission's Directorate-General for Taxation and Customs Union by an EU Member State, thus businesses must apply to the relevant EU Member State in advance of the EU Commission's deadline. Once a

request is transmitted to the EU Commission, at least three meetings will take place with the Economic Tariff Questions Group (*i.e.*, a group of experts from the national administrations of EU Member States) over the next nine months, during which other interested EU Member States or Directorates-General of the Commission (for instance, the Directorate-General for Agriculture and Rural Development in the EU) may oppose the requested suspension or quota. In recent years, an increase in the number of applications submitted to, and approved by, the EU Commission appears to be attributable to the recent reform of the EU's GSP scheme, which now provides preferential tariff rates to fewer developing countries than its previous version. EU businesses that use raw materials, semi-finished goods or components that are not available (or not sufficiently available) in the EU, especially if such goods are imported from a countries that previously benefited from the EU's GSP scheme, should seek expert advice in order to successfully lodge an application and manage the related EU procedure.

'GMO-free' claims on the rise in EU Member States

In recent years, '*GMO-free*' labels and claims on foodstuffs have spread across the EU. Contrary to the legal framework in the US, EU legislation requires manufacturers to label all food containing trace levels of genetically modified organisms (hereinafter, GMO) with the statement "*This product contains GMOs*". But, in addition, a number of EU Member States have established independent '*GMO-free*' labelling schemes, while other EU Member States are working on new systems. However, the labelling requirements in these national schemes differ significantly from each other and do not provide EU consumers with a unified system. Moreover, another issue is whether a need for '*GMO-free'* labels exists at all.

Regulation (EC) No. 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council on genetically modified food and feed and *Regulation (EC) No. 1830/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the traceability and labelling of genetically modified organisms and the traceability of food and feed products produced from genetically modified organisms and amending Directive 2001/18/EC* (hereinafter, Regulation (EC) No. 1830/2003) establish detailed requirements for the labelling of genetically modified food and feed. In particular, food containing traces of authorised genetically modified materials at a level above a 0.9% threshold must be labelled as such. It must be emphasised that the 0.9% threshold applies, according to Article 7 of Regulation (EC) No. 1830/2003, only to GMOs authorised at the EU level and not to unauthorised or unknown GMOs. However, EU legislation does not establish labelling requirements for food that has been obtained from animals fed with genetically modified feed, nor does it forbid the use of '*GMO-free*' labels signalling that foodstuffs do not contain GMOs, or were produced without GMOs.

The regulation on the labelling of genetically modified foods at the EU level is perceived by many consumers to be incomplete because, when shopping, they cannot recognise whether dairy products, eggs or meat have been obtained from animals that have received genetically modified feed. In addition, some consumers are highly critical of the exemption from GMO labelling of foods with traces of authorised GMOs below the 0.9% threshold.

Different '*GMO-free*' labels have been developed by EU Member States such as Austria, France and Germany, as well as in the region of South Tyrol in Italy. In Austria, the first '*GMO-free*' labels appeared in 1997. On 28 April 1998, shortly after a Referendum on GMOs, Austria published the first directive on the definition of '*GMO-free*' products, as part of the *Codex Alimentarius Austriacus* (*i.e.*, the *Lebensmittelbuch*, a collection of Austrian standards and product descriptions for a wide variety of foods). On 6 December 2007, after a complete revision, the Austrian Ministry of Health adopted a directive (amended in 2010 and 2012) on the definition of '*GMO-free production*' of foods and their labelling.

French Decree No. 2012-128 of 30 January 2012 concerns the voluntary labelling of foodstuffs originating from production chains qualified as '*GMO-free*' (hereinafter, Decree No. 2012-128). The rules contained therein implement a provision in the French Environmental Code that recognises the freedom to produce and consume products either with or without GMOs. Decree No. 2012-128 lays down different '*GMO-free*' claims that foodstuffs may carry when they are placed on the market, identifying three categories of ingredients that may permit '*GMO-free*' claims (*i.e.*, ingredients from vegetable origin; ingredients from livestock; and ingredients from apiculture) and laying down requirements applicable to each. Ingredients from vegetable origin may carry a '*GMO-free*' claim provided they have not been genetically modified or they have been obtained from feedstock that is, in no more than a 0.1% proportion, genetically modified (and provided that the presence of this proportion is adventitious and technically unavoidable). Ingredients from apiculture may be labelled as '*GMO-free within a 3km range*', provided that they originate from hives placed where nectar and pollen sources (as well as any complementary food for bees) are located within a GMO-free 3km range. For ingredients obtained from livestock, there are detailed requirements for the optional claims '*fed without GMOs (0.1%)*' or '*fed without GMOs (0.9%)*' and '*derived from animals fed without GMOs (0.1%)*' or '*derived from animals fed without GMOs (0.9%)*' for eggs and milk. Decree No. 2012-128 also establishes that the '*GMO-free*' claims outlined above may not advertise organoleptic, nutritional, health or environmental properties arising from the fact that the concerned products are '*GMO-free*'. There is no harmonised '*GMO-free*' labelling scheme or logo in France. This results in a number of private operators (such as Auchan, Bonduelle, Carrefour and Casino) affixing different '*GMO-free*' logos to their products' labels.

The German Law of 22 June 2004 implementing regulations of the EU in the field of genetic engineering and on the labelling of food produced without the use of genetic engineering techniques (hereinafter EGDGG in its German acronym) sets out that a food may be placed on the market or advertised with a sign that points to the manufacture of the food without the use of genetic engineering methods, when certain requirements are adhered to. The EGDGG also provides that only a '*Genetic Modification-free*' claim (*i.e.*, '*ohne Gentechnik*' or '*GM-free*') may be used. In the case of a food or a food ingredient of animal origin, the animal may not have been fed with feed labelled as GMOs for feed use, feed containing or consisting of GMOs, or feed produced from GMOs. For preparing, handling, processing or mixing of a food or food ingredient, no food, food ingredients, processing aids and materials produced by a GMO must have been used. This means that, in order to be labelled as '*GM-free*', no ingredients, food additives or processing aids, flavourings, vitamins, amino acids or enzymes produced with the help of genetically modified microorganisms may be used for food. A '*GM-free*' logo, awarded by the Foods without Genetic Modification Association (*Lebensmittel ohne Gentechnik e.V., VLOG*), was established in August 2009. The German Federal Ministry of Food and Agriculture has transferred the trademark rights to use the seal to the association.

There are also regional regulations such as the Provincial Law No. 11 of 22 January 2001 on the labelling of non-genetically modified foods (*Legge provinciale No. 11 del 22 gennaio 2001 sulla contrassegnazione di alimenti geneticamente non modificati*), as last amended on 19 July 2013, which applies in the Italian region of South Tyrol (Alto Adige).

New '*GMO-free*' schemes are also being developed. In March 2014, the Ministry of Agriculture of Luxembourg published the project of a regulation on the labelling of foodstuffs produced without GMOs (*Projet de règlement grand-ducal relatif à l'étiquetage des denrées alimentaires produites sans OGM*) for comments. It appears that this bill has not yet been adopted. According to sources, the Hungarian Ministry of Agriculture is also working on the introduction of a new labelling system by the end of 2015 that would enable foods such as meat, fish, eggs, milk and honey to be labelled as '*GMO-free*', if certified as not containing GMOs and if the livestock receives only GMO-free feed. The UK Food Standards Agency (FSA) has conducted qualitative and quantitative research on consumer attitudes to the labelling of

genetically modified food and the use of '*GMO-free*' labelling, but has not yet introduced such a scheme.

In the meeting of 23 June 2004 of the EU Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (section on genetically modified food and feed and environmental risk), the EU Commission expressed the view that, for food categories that have not been genetically modified, a '*GMO-free*' label on food products would suggest that they possess a special characteristic, when in fact all similar food products possess the same characteristic, which is considered misleading under EU food labelling law. This perhaps '*extreme*' position may no longer be valid, in particular in view of the labelling of animal products. A question could be whether an egg produced in a '*GMO-free*' environment has different characteristics than an egg laid by a hen fed with genetically modified feed.

The plethora of measures, logos and schemes described above shows that there is no EU-wide harmonised approach to the labelling of products as '*GMO-free*'. Differences in the national and regional rules for '*GMO-free*' labels rest, *inter alia*, in the scope (*i.e.*, the ingredients covered), as well as if and how transition periods are foreseen in the case of animals fed with '*GMO-free*' feed. Furthermore, the type and details of the control systems differ widely. The French system has several peculiarities: it provides for two alternatives with respect to the labelling of animal products obtained with '*GMO-free*' feed (*i.e.*, below a 0.1% and below a 0.9% threshold). Secondly, it provides requirements for minimal distances in the case of ingredients from apiculture (*i.e.*, 3km range).

Besides a fragmentation of labelling requirements for '*GMO-free*' foods in the EU's Internal Market, there is a second matter of concern. As stated above, the 0.9% threshold applies only to GMOs that are authorised at EU level and not to unauthorised or unknown GMOs. *Directive (EU) 2015/412 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 11 March 2015 amending Directive 2001/18/EC as regards the possibility for the Member States to restrict or prohibit the cultivation of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) in their territory* essentially establishes the possibility for EU Member States to '*opt-out*' (for more background, see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 7 of 9 April 2010, Issue No. 3 of 11 February 2011, Issue No. 6 of 23 March 2012, and Issue No. 6 of 21 March 2014). Directive (EU) 2015/412 states that, in accordance with Article 2(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU), EU Member States are entitled to have the possibility to adopt legally binding acts restricting or prohibiting the cultivation of GMOs in their territory after such GMOs have been authorised for placement on the EU market. Such restrictions or prohibitions are permitted under Directive (EU) 2015/412, provided that such measures are in conformity with EU law, reasoned, proportional and non-discriminatory and, in addition, are based on compelling grounds such as those related to: (a) environmental policy objectives; (b) town and country planning; (c) land use; (d) socioeconomic impacts; (e) avoidance of GMO presence in other products; (f) agricultural policy objectives; and (g) public policy. Reportedly, Hungary could be the first country to introduce regulations allowing to ban the cultivation of GMO crops on its territory.

Under a system that permits EU Member States to '*opt-out*', what would happen when, *inter alia*, a Spanish product sold in Austria contains traces of a GMO, which is authorised in the EU, but restricted or prohibited in Austria (but not in Spain)? Can this product bear a '*GMO-free*' claim? There could also be an issue with rivalling schemes and logos and different requirements (in particular, whether animals were fed with genetically modified feed). Can a French product labelled '*derived from animals fed without GMOs (0.1%)*' bear such a claim in Germany?

Reportedly, demand for '*GMO-free*' food is growing and, in 2015 alone, 3.5% of new product launches in Germany, 2.4% in the UK and 4.7% in Italy made '*GMO-free*' claims. These figures are rising, as it can be seen in Germany, where '*GMO-free*' labels are on 20% of every

new egg or egg product launched (marking a 12% increase in only two years). Arguably, there are reasons for '*GMO-free*' labels, in particular for animal products. For example, certain consumers demand full transparency and choice on the use of GMOs in the food they buy. However, the current situation of diverging '*GMO-free*' claims among EU Member States is complex for consumers and food business operators alike, which are faced with costly '*GMO-free*' certification schemes in various EU Member States. Due to national particularities, harmonisation at the EU level appears difficult. At the international level, it appears to be even more problematic, where attempts to establish a FAO/WHO Codex Standard on the labelling of GMO food so far failed. Operators in the EU, or exporting to the EU, are recommended to obtain expert advice when they are considering labelling their products as '*GMO-free*'.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Commission Regulation (EU) 2015/1190 of 20 July 2015 amending Annex III to Regulation (EC) No. 1223/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council on cosmetic products*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1153 of 14 July 2015 amending Annex I to Regulation (EC) No. 798/2008 as regards the entry for the United States in the list of third countries, territories, zones or compartments from which certain poultry commodities may be imported into or transit through the Union in relation to highly pathogenic avian influenza following further outbreaks in that country*

- *Decision No. 1/2014 of the EU-Central America Association Council of 7 November 2014 adopting its Rules of Procedure and those of the Association Committee [2015/1215]*

Trade Remedies

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1206 of 23 July 2015 terminating the anti-subsidy proceeding concerning imports of stainless steel cold-rolled flat products originating in the People's Republic of China and repealing Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1331/2014 making imports of stainless steel cold-rolled flat products originating in the People's Republic of China and Taiwan subject to registration*

- *Regulation (EU) 2015/1145 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 July 2015 on the safeguard measures provided for in the Agreement between the European Economic Community and the Swiss Confederation*

- *Decision No. 5/2014 of the EU-Central America Association Council of 7 November 2014 on the geographical indications to be included in Annex XVIII of the Agreement [2015/1219]*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Implementing Directive (EU) 2015/1168 of 15 July 2015 amending Directives 2003/90/EC and 2003/91/EC setting out implementing measures for the purposes of Article 7 of Council Directive 2002/53/EC and Article 7 of*

Council Directive 2002/55/EC respectively, as regards the characteristics to be covered as a minimum by the examination and the minimum conditions for examining certain varieties of agricultural plant species and vegetable species

Other

- *Council Decision (EU) 2015/1211 of 20 July 2015 establishing the position to be taken on behalf of the European Union within the General Council of the World Trade Organization on the accession of the Republic of Kazakhstan to the World Trade Organization*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2015/1170 of 16 July 2015 adding to the 2015 fishing quotas certain quantities withheld in the year 2014 pursuant to Article 4(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No. 847/96*

- *Commission Decision (EU) 2015/1158 of 8 July 2015 on the position to be taken by the Commission, on behalf of the European Union, in the Joint Implementation Committee set up by the Voluntary Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Indonesia on Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade in timber products into the European Union as regards the amendments to the Annexes I, II, and V of the Voluntary Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Indonesia*

NOTE TO SUBSCRIBERS

Dear Readers of Trade Perspectives©,

Please note that Trade Perspectives© will take an editorial break during the WTO's August recess and will resume its fortnightly publication schedule on 11 September 2015. We thank you for your continued interest in Trade Perspectives© and look forward to starting again with renewed energy and enthusiasm our dialogues on international trade as of this Fall.

The Trade Perspectives© Team

Ignacio Carreño, Eugenia Laurenza, Anna Martelloni, Blanca Salas, Bruno G. Simões and Paolo R. Vergano contributed to this issue.

FratiniVergano specializes in European and international law, notably WTO and EU trade law, EU agricultural and food law, EU competition and internal market law, EU regulation and public affairs. For more information, please contact us at:

FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS

Rue de Haerne 42, B-1040 Brussels, Belgium Tel.: +32 2 648 21 61 - Fax: +32 2 646 02 70
www.FratiniVergano.eu

Trade Perspectives© is issued with the purpose of informing on new developments in international trade and stimulating reflections on the legal and commercial issued involved. Trade Perspectives© does not constitute legal advice and is not, therefore, intended to be relied on or create any client/lawyer relationship.

To stop receiving Trade Perspectives© or for new recipients to be added to our circulation list, please contact us at:
TradePerspectives@FratiniVergano.eu