FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 23 of 14 December 2012

Season's Greetings

2012 is drawing to a close and all of us in the Trade Group of FratiniVergano would like to wish you, your colleagues and families all the best for a peaceful holiday season and for a successful and healthy 2013. We hope that you have enjoyed Trade Perspectives© throughout this year and that you have always found it stimulating and timely. We have again published a total of 23 issues and invested a great deal of time and energy in this undertaking. You can find all previous issues on our website (http://www.fratinivergano.eu/TradePerspectives.html).

For the year to come, we plan on continuing our editorial efforts and on entertaining a close dialogue with our readers. Trade Perspectives is now circulated to over 3,000 recipients worldwide and not a single week goes by without new readers asking to be added to our circulation list. This fills us with pride, but also with a considerable sense of commitment and discipline towards our readers' expectations.

We often hear from some of you with praises, criticisms, new ideas, comments and thoughts. Thank you for your interest in our publication and for helping us make it a better and more useful tool of discussion. As always, we would be particularly interested in knowing your views on Trade Perspectives' format, editorial structure and sections. If you think that anything should be done differently or could be improved, please do not hesitate to share your suggestions with us. We look forward to hearing from you and to another year of exciting trade developments and discussions.

Norway is considering significant tariff changes regarding meat and cheese

Tensions between Norway and the EU have reportedly increased after the Norwegian Government proposed to raise import tariffs on meat and cheese as part of its national budget for 2013. In particular, changes would include (i) a switch from specific to *ad valorem* duties for six tariff lines comprising certain types of beef and lamb meat and cheese; and (ii) an import quota of 500 tons of beef steaks and fillets from developing countries at reduced duties. The proposal was presented by the Norwegian Government to the Parliament (the '*Storting*') on 8 October 2012. Discussions started on 27 November 2012 and the final version is expected to be adopted in December 2012, so that it can eventually come into force on 1 January 2013.

In particular, the Norwegian proposal envisages a switch in the calculation of tariffs regarding a number of tariff lines concerning beef steaks and fillets, lamb carcasses and hard cheeses (*i.e.*, Norwegian Customs Tariff codes 0201.30.01, 0202.30.01, 0204.10.00, 0204.30.00, 0406.90.91, 0406.90.98, 0406.90.99, and 0406.90.92). The proposal suggests that duties no longer be calculated by applying a fixed rate per kilo of imported meat or cheese (*i.e.*, specific duties), but that they instead be calculated on the basis of their value

(*i.e*., *ad valorem* duties). In practice, the switch would result in a significant rise in the final prices of the affected products, which could eventually *de facto* impair foreign beef, lamb and cheese access to the Norwegian market. In this light, the proposal has given rise to heated debate and opposition, not only from Norwegian consumers, but also from Norway's main trading partners in agricultural products, namely the EU and certain individual EU Member States.

Tariffs constitute an important source of revenue for governments. Unlike other instruments of protection against imports, customs duties are in principle allowed under WTO law, provided that they are levied in compliance with a number of requirements. In particular, Article II:1(b) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade prevents WTO Members from applying customs duties on imports originating from other Members in excess of the '*bound*' rates foreseen in their Schedule of Concessions. Under Norway's Schedule of Concessions, the tariff lines affected by the proposed legislative changes are '*bound*' by a ceiling of maximum duties determined on the basis of two alternative values, specific and *ad valorem*, '*whichever is the highest*'. Under the current system of tariffs, the aforementioned products are subjected to the highest possible specific duties, whereas the proposed system envisages that they be subjected to the highest possible *ad valorem* duties. In this regard, Norway's tariffs, whether specific or *ad valorem,* appear to remain within the rates bound in its Schedule of Concessions.

In relation to EU-Norway relations, it is noted that Norway is bound by the provisions of the Agreement on the European Economic Area (hereinafter, EEA Agreement), which seeks to foster trade and economic relations among its Contracting Parties. Although agriculture is, together with a number of other policies, excluded from the scope of the EEA Agreement, Article 19 thereof still requires that Contracting Parties work towards progressive liberalisation of trade in agricultural products. However, the loose wording of such provision suggests that its legal enforceability might not to be as tangible as with other obligations. In any case, the EU would always be able to refer the issue to the EEA Joint Committee, competent for the settling of disputes between Contracting Parties to the EEA Agreement. Thus far, the EU has already manifested its disagreement with the draft budget, particularly because of Norway not having notified it to the EU prior to its discussion within the Norwegian Parliament. In particular, the EU Commission appears to have already addressed a letter to Norway's Ministry of Agriculture in May 2012, where it warned the Ministry against the possible consequences of a tariff rise on cheese. In addition, the issue was discussed at the meeting of the EU Parliament's Committee on International Trade (INTA Committee) of 26 and 27 November 2012. In an exchange of views with Norway's Ambassador to the EU, the latter asserted that the proposed measures fall squarely within the scope of Norway's national budget, which is subject to unilateral discussion and adoption by Norwegian institutions and, therefore, communication to the EU Commission did not have to occur until the measures under negotiation would become public.

According to reports from the EU Commission's DG Agri, should the proposed measures be finally adopted, they would have a devastating direct impact on exports from the EU to Norway of the concerned products, particularly in the case of lamb meat and cheese. Thus far, Norway asserts that its proposal is fully consistent with all its international obligations, both under the WTO and the EEA Agreement. Nevertheless, both frameworks provide the EU with possible legal instruments to challenge Norway's controversial measures and to seek a decision from an adjudicatory body. Businesses operating in the sectors that stand to be affected by the proposed tariff changes are advised to closely monitor the upcoming legislative developments in Norway and to interact with EU and/or Norwegian Institutions to try and minimise the effects on their trade.

Following a lack of opposition from the EU Council and the EU Parliament, the EU Commission can now adopt a regulation permitting the use of lactic acid to reduce microbiological surface contamination on bovine carcasses

Following the failure of the EU Parliament's Committee on the Environment (ENVI) to adopt a resolution on 28 November 2012 objecting to a proposed regulation permitting the use of lactic acid to reduce microbiological surface contamination on bovine carcasses and the impossibility of reaching an agreement (*i.e.*, a qualified majority) either in favour of or against the proposal for a regulation, during the 29 November 2012 meeting of the EU agricultural ministers in the EU Council, the EU Commission can now finalise the legislative procedure and allow the use of lactic acid for decontamination of beef carcasses (whole, halves and quarters, at the level of the slaughterhouse). In the EU Council, Austria, France, Greece, Latvia, and Poland all voted against the proposed regulation.

Lactic acid is a natural and common component of many foods. It is formed by natural fermentation in products such as milk, cheese, yogurt, soy sauce, sourdough, meat products and pickled vegetables. Contrary to what the name suggests, commercial lactic acid is not derived from milk, but mainly through the fermentation of beet/cane sugar or glucose, or produced synthetically. It has a natural antimicrobial function, which is the basis of the preservation achieved in fermented foods.

In January 2012, the EU Commission presented a proposal (under the regulatory procedure with scrutiny system) to the EU Parliament and EU Council, following an application from the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) of 14 December 2010, for evaluation and approval of the use of lactic acid for the decontamination of beef carcases and meat. On 26 July 2011, the European Food Safety Authority (hereinafter, EFSA) adopted a favourable scientific opinion and presented it to the EU Member States at the EU Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (hereinafter, SCoFCAH). The EFSA's scientific opinion, which considered the dossier in terms of safety and efficacy, concluded that the treatment would not constitute a safety concern provided that the substance used complies with EU specifications for lactic acid as a food additive. This conclusion was based on the expected low level of exposure and the fact that lactic acid is a naturally occurring substance (it is, *inter alia,* already present in meat). On efficacy, the EFSA held that the application demonstrated evidence that lactic acid reduces the prevalence of Salmonella, Verocytoxin producing E.coli and naturally-occurring Enterobacteriaceae to varying degrees. At its meeting on 21 September 2012, the SCoFCAH was unable to achieve the qualified majority necessary to deliver an opinion for or against the authorisation measure proposed by the EU Commission.

Concerns were expressed that the authorisation of lactic acid use on beef may open the door for approval of less acceptable antimicrobial treatments (*inter alia*, chlorine-based decontaminants), with the lack of labelling provisions in the proposal, and over the conditions of use, so that it would not become a substitute for good hygienic practices. The draft proposal does not, in fact, provide for the labelling of products treated with lactic acid. The EU Commission's rationale for not including a provision on labelling originates from the EFSA's scientific opinion that the treatment would be of no safety concern, provided that the substance used complies with EU specifications for food additives and that only very small quantities of lactic acid are left on the meat when used as specified in the proposal (and the impossibility to differentiate it from natural lactic acid, which could lead to difficulties with enforcement). According to *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1129/2011 amending Annex II to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council by establishing an EU list of food additives*, lactic acid (E 270) is permitted as an additive to a number of foods (*inter alia*, mozzarella, whey cheese, canned or bottled fruit and vegetables, certain jams, fresh pasta, certain breads, fruit nectars, certain foods for infants and young

children, and beer and malt beverages). However, it is not permitted as an additive to meat and meat products.

In addition, the EU Commission held that, if products treated with lactic acid were labelled, then there would be a need to address the labelling of products made from treated meat later in the food chain, making it difficult to determine at what point labelling would no longer be required. In the absence of an opinion of the SCoFCAH and the lack of a position in the EU Parliament and the EU Council, either in favour or against the proposal, the EU Commission can now adopt the proposed regulation.

The legal basis for the measure is *Regulation (EC) No. 853/2004 laying down specific hygiene rules for food of animal origin,* in particular Article 3(2) thereof, which provides that substances other than potable water (or clean water, where permitted) cannot be used to remove surface contamination from foods of animal origin unless the use of the substance has been approved. At present, no such approval has been granted. In the US, a range of substances are permitted to be used to reduce surface contamination. However, meat produced using these substances is not currently allowed to be imported into the EU. The US views this as a trade barrier, arguing that the controlled use of such post-slaughter decontamination treatments is both safe and effective in reducing the number of pathogens on the surface of meat.

As to the international trade implications, in the EU Council's meeting (Agriculture and Fisheries) on 28 and 29 November 2012, it was stated that *'since lactic acid is widely used by US beef industry, the lactic acid regulation is informally linked to the 2009 bilateral memorandum of understanding (MOU) between the US and the EU on beef trade. On 1 July 2012, and in accordance with the second phase of the MOU, the EU opened an increased import quota (TRQ) for beef not treated with hormones. Authorisation of the use of lactic acid would allow the US to fill this export quota'.* In fact, beginning on 1 July 2012, the TRQ for imports of hormone-free beef was increased from 20,000 metric tons annually to 45,975 metric tons (48,200 tonnes as of 1 July 2013), according to *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 481/2012 laying down rules for the management of a tariff quota for high-quality beef*. The TRQ increase is part of the 2009 MOU between the US and the EU, which ended the dispute at the WTO that had started in 1989 over the EU's ban on US beef raised with artificial growth hormones. In the MOU, the US agreed to end its retaliatory tariffs against EU products as part of the agreement to allow hormone-free beef into the EU.

The measure has been welcomed by US meat exporters as it will allow increased import of US beef, which is widely treated with lactic acid, into the EU. Reportedly, the European Livestock and Meat Trades Union (UECBV) welcomed the outcome of the debate in the EU institutions. However, the UECBV noted that lactic acid should be used as a complimentary tool by meat producers on a voluntary basis, which would reinforce, rather than undermine, meat hygiene. The UK National Farmers Union (NFU) expressed its support for the proposal only on condition that the approval for the use of lactic acid be used as a spot treatment (as opposed to all bovine carcases) and become part of good hygienic practices and HACCP-based systems. The European Consumers' Organisation BEUC, on the contrary, was rather critical and argued that the treatment could be used to mask poor hygiene practices and consumers would not be properly informed.

The adoption of the regulation by the EU Commission (expected at the beginning of 2013) may also have a bearing on any future proposal for the use of lactic acid on, *inter alia*, poultry meat carcases. Separate approval for use on poultry would be needed. Operators should closely monitor whether and when the EU Commission finally adopts the regulation permitting the use of lactic acid as a decontamination agent on beef carcasses and, if there is a need, consider achieving permission for its use also on poultry meat, or even further, permits of other treatments to remove surface contamination from products of animal origin.

'Reasonable period of time' determined by WTO arbitrator in the US – COOL dispute

On 4 December 2012, a WTO arbitrator determined the reasonable period of time (hereinafter, RPT) for the US in the dispute with Mexico and Canada concerning certain Country of Origin Labelling (hereinafter, COOL) requirements for agricultural products. The arbitrator determined that the US will have to implement the recommendations and rulings of the WTO Dispute Settlement Body (hereinafter, the DSB) in this dispute within 10 months from the date of adoption of the Panel and Appellate Body Reports on 23 July 2012 (*i.e.*, before 23 May 2013).

This case commenced on 1 and 17 December 2008, respectively, when Canada and Mexico independently requested consultations with the US. The request for consultations concerned a series of statutory and regulatory instruments pertaining to certain mandatory US COOL provisions requiring consumers to be informed at the retail level of the country of origin of certain agricultural products (*i.e.*, meat products such as beef, veal, lamb and pork). In particular, for products produced in the integrated North American marketplace, the US COOL framework requires that the label indicate every country in which a stage of production has taken place (*i.e.*, where animals were born, raised and slaughtered). In addition, it provides that the covered agricultural goods can only be labelled as originating in the US if all production activities associated with them occurred on US soil or in US waters (*e.g.*, only the beef and pork derived from cattle born, raised and slaughtered in the US can be labelled as originating from the US). These requirements constitute a significant departure from the previous US regime, which considered the meat from cattle born in Mexico and Canada, which was later raised and slaughtered in the US, as originating in the US. As parties failed to settle the dispute through consultations, on 7 and 9 October 2009, respectively, Canada and Mexico requested for the establishment of a WTO Panel. Mexican and Canadian authorities considered the COOL provisions to be in violation of the US commitments under various WTO agreements, in particular the GATT, the Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures, the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (hereinafter, TBT Agreement) and the Agreement on Rules of Origin. One single Panel was established to analyse the claims of the two complainants.

The *US – COOL* was the third WTO report released in 2012 (following *US – Clove Cigarettes* and *US – Tuna II (Mexico)*), which provided important jurisprudential guidance on the scope of Article 2.1 and 2.2 of the TBT Agreement, two provisions that had previously received little analysis by WTO dispute settlement bodies. In this regard, with respect to claims made by Mexico and Canada under the TBT Agreement, the Panel issued its final decision on 18 November 2011, ruling that the COOL requirements (1) constitute a '*technical regulation*' within the meaning of paragraph 1 of Annex 1; (2) violate Article 2.1 of the TBT Agreement, inasmuch as the imported livestock is granted less favorable treatment than that accorded to '*like*' domestic cattle, especially regarding muscle cut meat labels; and (3) violate Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement, inasmuch as they are more trade-restrictive than necessary to achieve the consumer protection objectives being sought (for the detailed analysis of the Panel ruling, see Trade Perspectives, Issue 22 of 2 December 2011). On 29 March 2012, the US appealed the Panel's decision and the Appellate Body issued its final Report, on 29 June 2012, upholding, albeit for different reasons, the Panel's finding that the COOL requirements violated, *inter alia*, Articles 2.1 and 2.2 of the TBT Agreement (for additional background on the Appellate Body's decision, see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 14 of 13 July 2012).

On 23 July 2012, the DSB adopted the Panel and the Appellate Body reports in *US – COOL*. Following this adoption, according to Article 21.3(c) of the WTO Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (hereinafter, DSU), the implementing party shall immediately comply with the recommendations and rulings of the DSB, but if it is '*impracticable*', a RPT is available to the Member (*i.e.*, a period of time (1) proposed by the

Member concerned, if approved by the DSB; or (2) mutually agreed by the parties; or (3) determined through binding arbitration). As consultations with the US did not result in an agreement on the RPT, Canada and Mexico requested that such period be determined through binding arbitration pursuant to Article 21.3(c) of the DSU. In the case at stake, the US required a RPT of 18 months for compliance, arguing that its legislative and regulatory process and the technical complexity of the measure itself were relevant circumstances to be taken into consideration by the arbitrator. In this regard, Article 21.3 of the DSU states that the RPT should not exceed 15 months from the date of adoption of a Panel or Appellate Body report. However, previous arbitrators have affirmed that a RPT must be interpreted consistently with the notions of flexibility and balance that are inherent in the concept of '*reasonableness'* and that, while it should be defined on a case-by-case basis in light of the specific circumstances of each investigation, it should also be the shortest period possible within the legal system of the Member to implement the recommendations and rulings of the DSB, in the context of the requirement of '*prompt compliance*' of Article 21.1 of the DSU. Thus, a RPT may be shorter or longer than 15 months, depending upon the particular circumstances of the case. Nonetheless, the length of the RPT in previous arbitrations under Article 21.3(c) has normally been between 6 to 15 months (*e.g.*, 6 months in *Canada – Pharmaceutical Patents*; 8 months in *Australia – Salmon*; 14 months in *EC – Tariff Preferences*; and 15 months in *EC – Hormones*). Indeed, the arbitrator, recognising that these 15 months are simply a guideline for the arbitrator, and not a rule, determined that in this specific case 10 months were appropriate for the US to comply. The US must comply within this period of time or otherwise face the risk of '*retaliatory'* trade measures applied by Canada and Mexico, if allowed by the DSB. Such retaliation may consist in increasing customs duties on the US products that currently enjoy duty-free access to the Mexican and Canadian market under the NAFTA.

Canadian and Mexican beef and pork exporters will stand to gain greatly if the US amends its COOL measures or even eliminates such a scheme within the RPT determined. Mexico and Canada have a substantial interest in this dispute, given the commercial importance of the US market for both Mexican and Canadian exports of agricultural products. In 2011, Mexican and Canadian exports accounted for 100% of foreign purchases of cattle and 41% of imports of beef in the US. In particular, US compliance within this RPT will have significant consequences for business parties with a stake in the North American pork and cattle industries, which should therefore monitor the developments in this field with particular attention. Furthermore, the imposition of additional COOL requirements by the US demonstrates the general trend in most jurisdictions to secure complete, full and accurate provision of information for consumers, notably on the most sensitive agricultural products. Therefore, businesses should carefully follow any similar scheme applied in other countries and eventually take steps to challenge them in light of the WTO assessment in the *US – COOL* case.

The EU-China '10 plus 10' Geographical Indications project has been completed

The EU's '*10 plus 10*' mutual recognition project has been finalised, confirming the incorporation of 10 famous EU food names in China, namely, '*Comté*', '*Grana Padano*', '*Rouquefort*', '*West Country Farmhouse Cheddar'*, '*White Stilton/Blue Stilton*' cheeses; '*Priego de Córdoba*' and '*Sierra Mágina*' olive oil; '*Prosciutto di Parma*' ham, '*Pruneaux d'Agen/Pruneaux d'Agen mi-cuits*' dried fruit and '*Scottish Farmed Salmon*', into the official Chinese geographical indications register (the *AQSIQ* Register). The initiative, which began in July 2007 after the EU and China formally lodged applications for the protection of 10 agricultural geographical indications (hereinafter, GIs) in each other's territories, marks the first time that the EU had launched an initiative to grant protection and authentication for a group of GIs outside the framework of a bilateral agreement. For its part, the EU (through the EU Commission) examined and finally incorporated 10 Chinese product names into the EU

GI register. These include '*Yancheng Long Xia*' crayfish, '*Zhenjiang Xiang Cu*' rice vinegar, '*Dongshan Bai Lu Sun*' asparagus, '*Jinxiang Da Suan*' garlic, '*Lixian Ma Shan Yao*' yam and '*Longkou Fen Si*' vermicelli/noodles which have now been designated Protected Geographical Indications (hereinafter, PGIs) and the designation of '*Pinggu Da Tao*' peaches, '*Longjing cha*' tea, '*Guanxi Mi You*' honey pomelos, '*Shaanxi ping guo*' apples respectively as Protected Designations of Origin (hereinafter, PDOs).

GIs (*i.e.*, PGIs in EU terminology) are place names, or words associated with a geographical location and used to identify products which have a certain quality or reputation due to their origin. According to the EU Commission, which has, on behalf of the EU, long advocated the strengthening of such measures within the framework of the WTO, such indications can protect the legal interest of the manufacturer, whose product value would otherwise become diluted, as well as of the consumers of such goods, who may be misled by other producers copying or free-riding on the original products. Since 1992, EU legislation has provided for the protection of PDOs and PGIs according to the process set out under the EU framework in *Regulation (EC) No. 510/2006 of the Council on the protection of geographical indications and designations of origin for agricultural products and foodstuffs* (hereinafter, Regulation No. 510/2006), which repealed and replaced Regulation (EEC) No. 2081/92. According to Article 2(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No. 510/2006, the agricultural product or foodstuff concerned must: (1) originate from a region, specific place or country defined area; (2) involve either one production and/or processing and/or preparation process, which takes place in the defined area; and (3) have qualities, reputations or other characteristics, which are clearly linked to the geographical origin of goods in order to qualify as a PGI. A designation of origin is similarly defined under Article 2(1)(b) of Regulation (EC) No. 510/2006, the emphasis here being put on the fact that the qualities or characteristics present are essentially or exclusively due to a particular geographical environment. In addition, both must comply with specifications for describing the '*principal physical, chemical microbiological or organoleptic characteristics*' of the product under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No. 510/2006, as well as producing evidence that of the link, which allegedly gives rise to the product's unique proprietary traits.

The GI systems in both the EU and China were reportedly similar, with no significant differences and, although it has also been noted that up to the end of 2010, only '*French Cognac*' and '*Scotch whisky*' had been granted protection as GIs by the Chinese AQSIQ, protection for EU producers may be relatively straight forward. This protection may be made available by the Chinese AQSIQ authority where the country of origin of a product provides similar protection to that offered by the AQSIQ, or the country of origin and the Chinese Government have reached a consensus by signing a related agreement. This condition may be of interest in the near future, considering that that the '*10 plus 10*' initiative seems to have laid a good foundation for an EU-China bilateral agreement on the protection of GIs, with the EU Commission having confirmed in a press release as recently as 30 November 2012 that both parties were interested in concluding a broader agreement during the course of 2013.

The expansion of this pilot scheme to a bilateral agreement with China would be considered a step in the right direction for the EU Commission, who has long indicated that wider protection for GIs is a key goal for the EU pursuant to Article 23.4 of the WTO's Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (hereinafter, the TRIPs Agreement), which commits WTO Members to facilitate stronger protection for wine GIs by undertaking negotiations on a multilateral system of notification and registration of GIs, and also during the ongoing Doha Round of WTO negotiations. Particularly, EU-China cooperation on the protection of alcoholic beverages, which did not feature within the *'10 plus 10*' initiative, would be seen as a priority considering the lack of progress in setting up a multilateral GI register for wines and spirits at WTO level. While a consolidated draft proposal for a global register for GIs of wines and spirits was discussed at a special session of the WTO's Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Council on 13 January

2011, talks continue to be stalled over whether negotiations should extend to other products and if they should include talks on disclosure of origin in genetic material. Other WTO Members, most notably the US, have traditionally been much less enthusiastic (if not opposed) about expanding the EU's high level of protection reasoning that, for many consumers, the specific term protected under the various schemes has ceased to be associated with a particular geographic region, and is instead viewed as a generic term for a particular type of product, or in the case of '*Parma ham*' in Canada, even has protection as a trademark (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 15 of 30 July 2010).

In the meantime, these EU developments will be of interest to both EU and Chinese producers. While the incorporation of the specific GIs concerned will certainly be of immediate commercial benefit to the producers concerned, in protecting their products from imitations when trading within this newly extended area of protection, producers of other EU PGIs and PDOs should monitor whether the EU will expand its GI individually to other WTO Member countries in a similar way.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1163/2012 of 7 December 2012 laying down rules for the management and distribution of textile quotas established for the year 2013 under Council Regulation (EC) No. 517/94*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1162/2012 of 7 December 2012 amending Decision 2007/777/EC and Regulation (EC) No. 798/2008 as regards the entries for Russia in the lists of third countries from which certain meat, meat products and eggs may be introduced into the Union*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1158/2012 of 27 November 2012 amending Council Regulation (EC) No. 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade therein*

Trade Remedies

- *Regulation (EU) No. 1168/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12 December 2012 amending Council Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1192/2012 of 12 December 2012 terminating the registration of imports of gas fuelled, non-refillable pocket flint lighters consigned from Vietnam, whether declared as originating in Vietnam or not imposed by Regulation (EU) No. 548/2012*

- *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1153/2012 of 3 December 2012 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of chamois leather originating in the People's Republic of China following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Regulation (EC) No. 1225/2009*

Customs Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1180/2012 of 10 December 2012 amending Regulation (EEC) No. 2454/93 laying down provisions for the implementation of Council Regulation (EEC) No. 2913/92 establishing the Community Customs Code*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1159/2012 of 7 December 2012 amending Regulation (EEC) No. 2454/93 laying down provisions for the implementation of Council Regulation (EEC) No. 2913/92 establishing the Community Customs Code*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1190/2012 of 12 December 2012 concerning a Union target for the reduction of Salmonella Enteritidis and Salmonella Typhimurium in flocks of turkeys, as provided for in Regulation (EC) No. 2160/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1181/2012 of 10 December 2012 authorising an increase of the limits for the enrichment of wine produced using the grapes harvested in 2012 in certain wine-growing regions*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 7 December 2012 designating the EU reference laboratory for foot-and-mouth disease and repealing Decision 2006/393/EC (notified under document C(2012) 8901)*

- *Regulation (EU) No. 1151/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 on quality schemes for agricultural products and foodstuffs*

Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1185/2012 of 11 December 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No. 607/2009 laying down certain detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No. 479/2008 as regards protected designations of origin and geographical indications, traditional terms, labelling and presentation of certain wine sector products*

Other

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 11 December 2012 confirming the average specific emissions of CO2 and specific emissions targets for manufacturers of passenger cars for the calendar year 2011 pursuant to Regulation (EC) No. 443/2009 of the European Parliament and of the Council*

- *Euro-Mediterranean Aviation Agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, of the other part*

- *Council Decision of 29 November 2012 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 Tajikistan to the WTO*

- *Regulation (EU) No. 1152/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 amending Council Regulation (EC) No. 2371/2002 on the conservation and sustainable exploitation of fisheries resources under the common fisheries policy*

- *Directive 2012/34/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21 November 2012 establishing a single European railway area*

Patricia Arratíbel, Ignacio Carreño, Eugenia Laurenza, Anna Martelloni, Louise O'Farrell, Blanca Salas and Paolo R. Vergano contributed to this issue.