FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 10 of 18 May 2012

The WTO Appellate Body issued its report in *US – Tuna II (Mexico)*

On 16 May 2012, the WTO Appellate Body issued its report on the US – Tuna II (Mexico) dispute. The Appellate Body found the 'dolphin-safe' labelling scheme enacted by the US for the protection of dolphins during tuna fishing to be inconsistent with WTO law. Despite agreeing with the Panel that the measure constitutes a technical regulation within the meaning of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (hereinafter, TBT Agreement), the Appellate Body substantially reversed the Panel's findings on a number of points.

The contested measures comprise a number of US provisions establishing a labelling scheme for tuna to be marketed within the US as '*dolphin-safe*'. Under the measures, the requirements for being granted the label depend on the fishing method and the ocean area where tuna have been harvested and fished. The standard for eligibility excludes any tuna fished through so-called '*purse-seine*' mechanisms (using encircling nets that temporarily set on dolphins so as to attract the tuna swimming below), which are only used in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (hereinafter, ETP) areas, basically by Mexican fleets (inasmuch as it is in this area that tuna and dolphin swarms swim together). As a result, tuna of Mexican origin did not qualify for the '*dolphin-safe*' label, affecting its sales in the US market.

In its report issued in September 2011, the Panel found the contested measures to constitute a technical regulation inconsistent with Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement, inasmuch as the '*dolphin-safe*' labelling scheme was more trade-restrictive than necessary to meet the legitimate objectives of consumer information and protection of dolphins pursued by the US. The Panel, however, did not uphold Mexico's claims that the '*dolphin-safe*' label was also inconsistent with Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement, inasmuch as it did not find that the measure afforded tuna of Mexican origin a less favourable treatment than tuna from the US or any other country. A particularly controversial aspect of the Panel Report related to the mandatory nature of the labelling scheme (the US insisted that products could be lawfully offered for sale without the '*dolphin-safe*' label and thus there was no mandatory compliance with the labelling requirements for Mexican tuna exporters) and its qualification as a '*technical regulation*' within the meaning of Article 1.1 of the TBT Agreement (see Trade Perspective, Issue No. 17 of 23 September 2011).

The Appellate Body agreed with the Panel that the labelling scheme constitutes a technical regulation. According to the Appellate Body, the fact that the scheme defines '*dolphin-safe*' on the basis of a single requirement, hence excluding any others, as well as any other labels, makes it mandatory, and therefore a technical regulation. However, the Appellate Body reversed the Panel's findings on the compatibility of the US measures with Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the TBT Agreement.

In particular, the Appellate Body found that the labelling scheme accords less favourable treatment to Mexican tuna, in violation of Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement. According to the Appellate Body, the fact that most of the tuna from Mexico is not eligible for the label, while that from the US is, represents a modification of the conditions of competition that is detrimental to Mexican products, which is not justified by any legitimate regulatory requirement. Indeed, the fact that only *purse-seine* fished tuna is excluded from eligibility for the label is deemed insufficient for the purposes of addressing harm done to dolphins by fleets operating other methods outside the ETP. The Appellate Body also disagreed with the Panel in respect of its finding under Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement. It considered the alternative measures offered by Mexico unfit for the purposes of the pursued objectives, insofar as the level of protection achieved would be inferior to that actually achieved by the labelling scheme under dispute. Finally, the Appellate Body examined the US measures under Article 2.4 of the TBT Agreement, which requires that technical regulations be based on relevant international standards. Mexico claimed that the US had violated this provision inasmuch as its measures were more trade-restrictive than the standard set by the Agreement on the International Dolphin Conservation Program (hereinafter, AIDCP). The Appellate Body agreed with the Panel that the '*dolphin-safe*' labelling scheme did not violate Article 2.4 of the TBT Agreement, albeit on different grounds. According to the Appellate Body, two requirements need to be complied with for a '*standardisation body*' to enact '*relevant international standards*' within the meaning of Article 2.4 of the TBT Agreement, namely that (i) the body in question has recognised activities in standardisation; and (ii) its membership is open to at least all WTO Members. The Appellate Body found the AIDCP not to comply with the latter requirement, insofar as accession thereto is conditional upon invitation from a member.

The fact that the labelling scheme has been considered a '*technical regulation*', in spite of unlabelled tuna still being imported and marketed within the US, is of great relevance. Because the scheme is designed in a manner that precludes any other requirements to be satisfied for tuna to be '*dolphin-safe*', the measure is essentially regulating the definition of '*dolphin-safe*' in a binding fashion, and therefore constitutes a mandatory technical regulation. This determination has opened the door to a very broad interpretation of the term '*mandatory*', embracing the widest range of voluntary schemes with stringent requirements, compliance with which is still not requested for offering the product for sale, and is likely to have repercussions in other areas, ranging from sustainability standards to consumer labels. Companies affected by strict requirements applied by third countries through voluntary schemes are hence strongly advised to take this development into account. Finally, the Appellate Body's finding on what constitutes a '*relevant international standard*' for the purposes of the TBT Agreement is also of great relevance. A number of international and regional instruments may be found not to comply with the requirements set by the Appellate Body, so that technical regulations based on internationally-agreed standards are not necessarily shielded from possible inconsistency with the TBT Agreement.

The US could face a WTO challenge concerning subsidies affecting Caribbean rum

The Governments of the Caribbean Community (hereinafter, Caricom) have reportedly voiced their concerns to the US in relation to allegedly WTO-inconsistent subsidies granted by Puerto Rico and the United States' Virgin Islands (hereinafter, USVI) to rum producers established in these two territories. The complainants claim that these subsidies are being granted through funds that these territories receive from the US.

In particular, concerns relate to the US '*cover-over*' programme, where the US transfers 98% of the revenues collected on excise taxes imposed on rum sold in the US market to the Governments of Puerto Rico and the USVI. The precise share allocated to Puerto Rico and to the USVI is roughly based on the relative market share of rum produced in each territory, with respective floors being established in the text of the programme. The US '*cover-over*' programme does not provide any limitation as to how these two territories are to spend the transferred revenues. Until 2008, these funds were used for infrastructural development and welfare programmes by the Governments of the two territories. However, both territories are now said to be using some of these funds to finance activities aimed at the promotion and assistance of the local rum industry, to the detriment of rum producers established in Caricom countries.

Although the exact amount of the revenues spent on the promotion of the rum industry remains unclear, it has been reported that Puerto Rico spends around 6% of the funds it receives from the '*cover-over*' programme in the promotion of rums in general, and the remaining 94% in general outlays that rum producers could still benefit from to some extent. As for the USVI, the Public Finance Authority (hereinafter, VIPFA) issues tax-exempt bonds (often referred to as '*rum-tax bonds*') that are used to finance public infrastructure, such as roads, some of which are almost exclusively used by the rum industry. The first bond, issued in 2008, was used to enter into an agreement with the rum producer Diageo, under which Diageo was not only to begin operations in the USVI, but also to remain there for a minimum period of 30 years. Successive bonds were issued so as to confer Diageo a grant aimed at, *inter alia,* the acquisition, construction, development and equipping of a rum production and maturation warehouse facility. The VIPFA reportedly has entered into similar arrangements with rum maker Cruzan.

The subsidies granted by the USVI and Puerto Rico through the funds received under the '*cover-over*' programme appear to bear relevance *vis-à-vis* the US obligations under the WTO system. This issue is particularly complicated by the fact that, from a trade perspective, the status of Puerto Rico and the USVI *vis-à-vis* the US obligations to the WTO is not straightforward. Possible profiles of WTO inconsistency could relate to the characterisation of such measures as domestic subsidisation of agricultural products, and as providing discriminatory taxation within the US market. In particular, to the extent that these measures are being granted to '*domestic*' agricultural producers and constitute harmful subsidies falling within the category of '*amber box*' domestic support, they may be considered inconsistent with the US commitments under the WTO Agreement on Agriculture (hereinafter, AoA) in two ways: (i) they may lead the US to exceed the capped level of domestic support it has committed to, as expressed in its Schedule of Commitments; and (ii) they may violate the US commitments concerning export subsidisation of agricultural products, inasmuch as rum producers are able to use the funds to support their exports of rum to third countries. As a matter of fact, it has been reported that subsidised firms received funds amounting to a quantity that exceeds the US capacity of absorption of rum products. In addition, the non-discrimination obligations under Articles I and III of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter, the GATT) may also be of relevance. Under these provisions, respectively, the US is prevented from applying discriminatory fiscal treatment to imported products *vis-à-vis* foreign products or domestic products within its market. However, Article III:8 of the GATT expressly excludes from this obligation subsidies granted to '*domestic producers*', including payments derived from the proceeds of internal taxes.

Developments of the aforementioned situation, should it escalate to full-fledged WTO dispute settlement, are likely to shed additional light on the WTO-consistency of subsidies granted to agricultural products, as well as on the application of the non-discrimination requirements to fiscal incentives.

Progress achieved in the formation of a WTO-attached International Services Agreement

The value of world trade in services has more than doubled in the past decade, and continues to grow at a much higher rate than trade in goods. That being said, barriers to services trade remain fairly high, particularly in Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa (BRICS) and other developing countries. With the impasse in WTO services negotiations within the framework of the Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations, the idea of moving the trade agenda forward in services through plurilateral discussions on an International Services Agreement (hereinafter, ISA) was recently met with enthusiasm. The '*Really Good Friends of Services*' (hereinafter, RGFS), which includes, among others, the EU, NAFTA countries, Australia, Japan, Norway and Switzerland, have been meeting since January 2012 to discuss the formation of an ISA to increase trade in services and negotiate which provisions should be included in any proposed agreement.

The development of an ISA would be the result of the RGFS agreeing on expanding services market access and developing new, internationally agreed rules and standards affecting trade in services. The overwhelming consensus appears to rest in linking an ISA to the WTO, whether as a part of the WTO framework, which requires that the ISA be approved by three-fourths of WTO Members pursuant to Article IX(3) of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO (hereinafter, Marrakesh Agreement), or through Article V of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (hereinafter, GATS). As an approval of any proposed ISA under the threshold established by Article IX(3) of the Marrakesh Agreement appears unlikely, the RGFS are considering approving an ISA under Article V of the GATS. This appears possible, provided that the ISA meets the conditions specified therein, including that it must have '*substantial sector coverage*' and eliminate '*substantially all discrimination*', either at entry into force or on the basis of a reasonable time-frame between signatory parties. Incorporating the ISA under the WTO would allow the parties to utilise the WTO dispute settlement mechanism for resolving disagreements arising from the obligations under the ISA.

For business, the most important aspect of any proposed ISA relates to the scope of obligations included in this services agreement. To achieve substantial liberalisation of trade in services, any ISA should be really ambitious in coverage and in the level of commitments undertaken. For this to happen, it has been recommended that the parties apply a negative list approach for scheduling commitments. This would require trade negotiators and business groups to review all services sectors and identify which measures, sectors and/or modes of delivery should be placed in their country's list of exceptions. Next, discussions are taking place on whether to extend the ISA's MFN benefits to all WTO Members, or only to ISA signatories. The US and Australia propose that conditional MFN be applied only for members to the ISA, which would prevent '*free-riders'* (*e.g.*, Brazil, India and China) from benefitting without undertaking commitments. Third, it is suggested that the ISA further liberalise rules for the temporary movement of workers under Mode 4 of the GATS. Proposals for the liberalisation of Mode 4 include providing greater access for highly skilled and semi-skilled personnel. In addition, recommendations could be made for renegotiating 4 GATS disciplines within the ISA to include firmer language in relation to: (1) government procurement of services; (2) mutual recognition of professional qualifications; (3) competition policy; and (4) oversight of domestic consumer protection regulations to ensure that they do not create barriers to foreign suppliers. To that end, a '*necessity*' test, as found under Articles VI:4 and XIV of the GATS, Article XX of the GATT and Article VI:4 of the Disciplines on Domestic Regulation in the Accountancy Sector, could be included in the ISA to provide potential foreign suppliers with additional protection. Liberalisation of government procurement in services and strengthened competition policies in the generally protective and frequently monopolised fields of telecommunications, utilities and health care, would

result in significantly increased business and investment opportunities for EU companies worldwide.

Services continue to be the most dynamic aspect of world trade. With services exports between the RGFS already amounting to approximately USD 1.3 trillion annually, the adoption of an ISA could significantly further business opportunities and services exports. As the leading services exporter and largest services economy accounting for almost 25% of world trade in services, the EU and EU businesses should play a leading role in these negotiations. EU service providers should be active in voicing their opinions and concerns relating to services and the proposed ISA. Businesses interested in securing greater access to global markets, especially in the telecommunications, financial services, postal services, distribution, maritime transport, tourism, professional services and construction services fields should closely monitor these plurilateral negotiations, including statements made by the EU Commission relating to the ISA.

UNCTAD urges African nations to shift towards organic farming products - Opportunities for organic farming products in the EU

The Second African Organic Conference, organised by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (hereinafter, UNCTAD), the African Union, the International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements (hereinafter, IFOAM), the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (hereinafter, FAO), the Zambian Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the Organic Producers and Processors Association of Zambia and Grow Organic Africa, was held in Zambia from 2 to 4 May 2012, with the theme of *'mainstreaming organic agriculture into the African development agenda'* aimed at developing an African Organic Action Plan to stimulate expansion of the organic farming sector, modernise certification and organic equivalency systems to enhance trade in organic goods, and expand Africa's market for organic produce.

In the European Union, organic production is defined in *Council Regulation (EC) No. 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products* as an overall system of farm management and food production that combines best environmental practices, a high level of biodiversity, the preservation of natural resources, the application of high animal welfare standards and a production method in line with the preference of many consumers for products produced using natural substances and processes. Therefore, the organic production method plays a dual societal role: on the one hand, it provides for a specific market responding to a consumer demand for organic products; and, on the other hand, it delivers public goods contributing to the protection of the environment, animal welfare and rural development.

Basically, organic agriculture does not permit the use of artificial fertilisers or other chemicals, and preserves and enhances the soil, a fact which is of crucial importance in Africa where land degradation and desertification are of serious concern. At the conference, UNCTAD affirmed that it strongly supports the increasing use of organic farming practices on the continent as it was reported that Africa has more than one million hectares of arable land currently being used for organic farming and 530,000 certified organic farmers, with Ethiopia and Uganda each having more than 100,000 certified farms while Tanzania has about 85,000 (*i.e.*, Africa already has more certified organic farms than any other continent). It was also stressed that organic agriculture must be included in the list of current African development priorities, paying particular attention to the existing reality of capacity constraints and other challenges faced by African countries. Together with IFOAM, FAO and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), UNCTAD has worked in the past on reducing technical barriers to trade in organic produce by facilitating harmonisation and

mutual recognition of organic standards, which culminated in 2007 in the *East African Organic Products Standard* based on organic standards in place in the region, as well as the *IFOAM Basic Standards* and the *Codex Alimentarius guidelines for the production, processing, labelling and marketing of organically produced foods.*

The question now is what opportunities are available to African organic farming products in the EU. There are, in general, two regulatory schemes established for exporting organic farming products to the EU under *Council Regulation (EC) No. 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products* and its implementing *Commission Regulations (EC) No. 889/2008 and 1235/2007*: 1) Imports of organic products from a third country recognised as equivalent; and 2) Imports of organic products certified as organic by a certifier that is recognised by the EU Commission as a control authority or control body competent for the task of ensuring controls and certification in third countries concerned.

For the first option, the EU maintains a list of third countries recognised by the EU Commission as having production standards and control arrangements, which are equivalent to those established in EU legislation. Annex III of *Regulation (EC) No. 1235/2008 laying down detailed rules for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No. 834/2007 as regards the arrangements of organic products from third countries* lists as *'equivalent third countries'* one African country (*i.e.*, Tunisia), as well as Argentina, Australia, Canada, Costa Rica, India, Israel, Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, and since 1 June 2012 the US (See Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 4 of 25 February 2012). As to the second option, certain agricultural products imported from third countries are currently marketed in the EU pursuant to Article 19 of *Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1235/2008*, whereby organic products can be exported to the EU when they are certified as organic by a certifier that is recognised by the EU Commission. On 6 December 2011, the EU Commission adopted the *Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1267/2011 amending Regulation (EC) No. 1235/2008 laying down detailed rules for the arrangements for imports of organic products from third countries*, which includes the list of certification bodies operating in third countries, including certification bodies in certain African nations, such as Egypt, Ghana, Madagascar and Uganda.

The legal framework for exporting organic farming products to the EU is there. A key requirement for purposes of enhancing exports of African organic products to the EU is the establishment of equivalent standards and control measures on organic production. The harmonisation of African organic standards with the *Codex Alimentarius guidelines for the production, processing, labelling and marketing of organically produced foods* by means of initiatives like the *East African Organic Products Standard* has been an important step. Equivalence in the application of production standards with the organic production methods permitted in the EU must be verified through on-the-spot missions. The two regulatory options for permitting the export of organic farming products to the EU (*i.e.*, recognition as an equivalent third country after following the respective procedure or export of products to the EU certified as organic by a certifier that is recognised by the EU Commission) are already used for, *inter alia,* exporting organic coffee from Uganda or organic cactus fruit and dates from Tunisia, but more opportunities exist for African products.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 394/2012 of 8 May 2012 fixing the quantitative limit for exports of out-of-quota sugar and isoglucose until the end of the 2012/2013 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 395/2012 of 8 May 2012 opening a tariff quota for certain quantities of industrial sugar for the 2012/2013 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 393/2012 of 7 May 2012 amending Annex I to Regulation (EC) No. 798/2008 as regards the entry for Thailand in the lists of third countries or parts thereof from which poultry and poultry products may be imported into and transit through the Union*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 7 May 2012 amending Decisions 2005/692/EC, 2005/734/EC, 2007/25/EC and 2009/494/EC as regards avian influenza (notified under document C(2012) 2947)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 418/2012 of 16 May 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No. 376/2008 as regards licence obligations for certain agricultural products, and amending Regulation (EC) No. 1342/2003 as regards the transfer of rights deriving from licences for cereals and rice imported under tariff quotas*

Trade Remedies

- *Case C-338/10: Judgment of the Court (Third Chamber) of 22 March 2012 (reference for a preliminary ruling from the Finanzgericht Hamburg — Germany) — Grünwald Logistik Service GmbH (GLS) v Hauptzollamt Hamburg-Stadt (Dumping — Anti-dumping duty imposed on imports of certain prepared or preserved citrus fruits originating in China — Regulation (EC) No 1355/2008 — Validity — Regulation (EC) No 384/96 — Article 2(7)(a) — Determination of normal value — Non-market economy country — Commission's obligation to take due care to determine normal value on the basis of the price or constructed value in a market economy third country)*

- *Case T-113/06: Judgment of the General Court of 21 March 2012 — Marine Harvest Norway and Alsaker Fjordbruk v Council (Dumping — Imports of salmon originating in Norway — Definition of the Community industry — Like product — Composition of the sample of Community producers)*

- *Case T-115/06: Judgment of the General Court of 21 March 2012 — Fiskeri og Havbruksnæringens Landsforening and Others v Council (Dumping — Imports of salmon originating in Norway — Lesser duty rule — Calculation of minimum import prices and fixed duties)*

- *Commission Decision of 7 May 2012 terminating the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of certain seamless pipes and tubes of iron or steel, excluding seamless pipes and tubes of stainless steel, originating in Belarus*

- *Notice of the impending expiry of certain anti-dumping measures*

- *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 398/2012 of 7 May 2012 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 492/2010 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of sodium cyclamate originating in, inter alia, the People's Republic of China*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 402/2012 of 10 May 2012 imposing a provisional anti-dumping duty on imports of aluminium radiators originating in the People's Republic of China*

Customs Law

- *Council Regulation (EU) No. 389/2012 of 2 May 2012 on administrative cooperation in the field of excise duties and repealing Regulation (EC) No. 2073/2004*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 399/2012 of 7 May 2012 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 400/2012 of 7 May 2012 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 401/2012 of 7 May 2012 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature*

- *Regulation (EU) No. 388/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 April 2012 amending Council Regulation (EC) No.428/2009 setting up a Community regime for the control of exports, transfer, brokering and transit of dual-use items*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 8 May 2012 amending Decision 2008/855/EC as regards animal health control measures relating to classical swine fever in Germany (notified under document C(2012) 2992)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 390/2012 of 7 May 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No. 318/2007 laying down animal health conditions for imports of certain birds into the Community and the quarantine conditions thereof*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 10 May 2012 amending Annex II to Council Directive 2004/68/EC as regards the basic general criteria for a territory to be considered free from bluetongue (notified under document C(2012)*

- *Commission Decision of 10 May 2012 concerning the non-inclusion of dichlorvos for product type 18 in Annex I, IA or IB to Directive 98/8/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the placing of biocidal products on the market (notified under document C(2012) 3016)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 413/2012 of 15 May 2012 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 496/2011 as regards the minimum content of sodium benzoate as a feed additive in feed for weaned piglets*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 414/2012 of 15 May 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No. 554/2008 as regards the minimum content and the minimum recommended dose of an enzyme preparation of 6-phytase as a feed additive in feed for turkeys for fattening*

Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights

- *Publication of an application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No, 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs*

- *Publication of an amendment application pursuant to Article 6(2) of Council Regulation (EC) No. 510/2006 on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs*

- *Information notice — Public consultation — Geographical indications from Switzerland and Liechtenstein*

Other

- *Corrigendum to Commission Decision 2011/638/EU of 26 September 2011 on benchmarks to allocate greenhouse gas emission allowances free of charge to aircraft operators pursuant to Article 3e of Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 252, 28.9.2011)*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 2 May 2012 amending Decision 2011/207/EU establishing a specific control and inspection programme related to the recovery of bluefin tuna in the eastern Atlantic and the Mediterranean (notified under document C(2012) 2800)*

- *Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 392/2012 of 1 March 2012 supplementing Directive 2010/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to energy labelling of household tumble driers*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 7 May 2012 concerning the determination of start-up and shut-down periods for the purposes of Directive 2010/75/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council on industrial emissions (notified under document C(2012) 2948)*

- *Corrigendum to Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 392/2012 of 1 March 2012 supplementing Directive 2010/30/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council with regard to energy labelling of household tumble driers (OJ L 123, 9.5.2012)*

- *FLEGT voluntary partnership agreements European Parliament resolution of 19 January 2011 on FLEGT Voluntary Partnership Agreements*

- *Interim Partnership Agreement between the EC and the Pacific States European Parliament resolution of 19 January 2011 on the Interim Partnership Agreement between the EC and the Pacific States*

- *An EU Strategy for the Black Sea European Parliament resolution of 20 January 2011 on an EU Strategy for the Black Sea (2010/2087(INI))*

- *Protocol to the Euro-Mediterranean Agreement between the EC and Jordan, to take account of the accession of Bulgaria and Romania to the EU – European Parliament legislative resolution of 18 January 2011 on the draft Council decision on the conclusion of a Protocol to the Euro-Mediterranean Agreement establishing an Association between the European Communities and their Member States, of the one part, and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, of the other part, to take account of the accession of the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union (06903/2010 – C7-0384/2010 – 2007/0231(NLE))*

- *EU-Cameroon forest law agreement – European Parliament legislative resolution of 19 January 2011 on the draft Council decision on the conclusion of a Voluntary Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Cameroon on forest law enforcement, governance and trade in timber and derived products to the European Union (FLEGT) (12796/2010 – C7-0339/2010 – 2010/0217(NLE)*

- *EU-Republic of Congo forest law agreement – European Parliament legislative resolution of 19 January 2011 on the draft Council decision on the conclusion of a Voluntary Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of the Congo on forest law enforcement, governance and trade in timber and derived products to the European Union (FLEGT) (10028/2010 – C7-0170/2010 – 2010/0062(NLE))*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 16 May 2012 amending Decision 2008/589/EC establishing a specific control and inspection programme related to the cod stocks in the Baltic Sea*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 405/2012 of 4 May 2012 establishing a prohibition of fishing for northern prawn in Norwegian waters south of 62° N by vessels flying the flag of Sweden*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 406/2012 of 4 May 2012 establishing a prohibition of fishing for anglerfish in VIIIc, IX and X; EU waters of CECAF 34.1.1 by vessels flying the flag of France*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 407/2012 of 4 May 2012 establishing a prohibition of fishing for mackerel in VIIIc, IX and X; EU waters of CECAF 34.1.1 by vessels flying the flag of Portugal*

- *Notice concerning the provisional application of the Interim Agreement establishing a framework for an Economic Partnership Agreement between the Eastern and Southern Africa States, on the one part, and the European Community and its Member States, on the other part*

- *Council Decision of 24 April 2012 on the position to be taken by the European Union in the EEA Joint Committee concerning an amendment to Annex II (Technical regulations, standards, testing and certification) and Annex XX (Environment) to the EEA Agreement*

Ignacio Carreño, David A. Farrugia, Eugenia Laurenza, Anna Martelloni, Blanca Salas and Paolo R. Vergano contributed to this issue.