FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 10 of 16 May 2014

Declaration of the specific vegetable oil used in food will soon be mandatory in the EU

There are important changes in terms of the labelling of the different vegetable oils as ingredients in foodstuffs under *Regulation (EU) No. 1169/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 October 2011 on the provision of food information to consumers* (hereinafter, the Food Information Regulation, FIR), which are due to apply across the EU as of 13 December 2014. Over the last months, there have been calls to the Belgian, the French and the EU Parliaments to make the indication of palm oil mandatory in the labelling of foodstuffs. However, it must be noted that these pleas appear to be demagogical in nature and politically motivated as, in fact, this new labelling obligation was already decided a long time ago.

The FIR was not adopted to target any particular vegetable oil, but it generally provides that the specific vegetable oil(s) used in any given product must be indicated in the labelling of the package. In simple terms, the FIR no longer allows that the group name '*vegetable oils*' be used for any vegetable oil without specifying the specific oil(s), which was still permitted under the FIR's predecessor, *Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs* (hereinafter Directive 2000/13/EC). The application of the new labelling regime was delayed until 13 December 2014 in order to allow time for producers to adjust their labels.

It is important to note that the labelling of specific vegetable oils (including, *inter alia*, coconut, palm and sunflower oil) as an ingredient in food is currently (until 12 December 2014) not mandatory in the list of ingredients under harmonised EU food labelling law. Although, in principle, all of the ingredients in a foodstuff must be indicated in the list of ingredients, there are exceptions, such as for vegetable oils. Therefore, if a product contains palm oil, or sunflower oil, or both, the indication in the list of ingredients that it contains '*vegetable oil*' is sufficient. Article 6(1) of Directive 2000/13/EC states that '*Ingredients shall be listed in accordance with this Article and Annexes I, II, III and IIIa*'. Annex I lists the categories of ingredients that may be designated by the name of the category rather than the specific name. The first category of ingredients concerns oil: '*Refined oils other than olive oil*'

can be designated as '*oil, together with - either the adjective vegetable or animal, as appropriate, or - an indication of their specific vegetable or animal origin. The adjective hydrogenated must accompany the indication of hydrogenated oil*'. However, certain vegetable oils, like soy or peanut oil, already need to be declared separately, as they are allergens. Although the exception for vegetable oils was still included in the legislative proposal of 30 January 2008 for new food labelling rules, Members of the EU Parliament introduced, in an amendment to the proposal during the legislative procedure, the idea that the vegetable origin of the vegetable oil contained in foodstuffs should always be declared. On 1 February 2011, in the position of the Council at first reading, with a view to the adoption of the FIR in relation to oil/fat origin, the Council noted that more detailed information than the vegetal origin of the oil would represent further costs for food business operators and would not be justified considering the strengthening of the nutritional information and rejected the amendments presented by the EU Parliament. Despite the Council's opposition, the EU Parliament's view succeeded in the end and the amendment was adopted.

The possibility for '*vegetable oils*', like palm oil and other vegetable oils, to be labelled under the neutral category name '*vegetable oil*' has, therefore, not been included in the FIR. Article 18 of the FIR concerns the list of ingredients and provides that: '*1. The list of ingredients shall be headed or preceded by a suitable heading which consists of or includes the word ingredients. It shall include all the ingredients of the food, in descending order of weight, as recorded at the time of their use in the manufacture of the food. 2. Ingredients shall be designated by their specific name, where applicable, in accordance with the rules laid down in Article 17 and in Annex VI. 4. Technical rules for applying paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article are laid down in Annex VII'.* Part A of Annex VII sets out specific provisions concerning the indication of ingredients by descending order of weight and provides in No. 8 that: '*Refined oils of vegetable origin may be grouped together in the list of ingredients under the designation vegetable oils followed immediately by a list of indications of specific vegetable origin, and may be followed by the phrase in varying proportions. If grouped together, vegetable oils shall be included in the list of ingredients in accordance with Article 18(1), on the basis of the total weight of the vegetable oils present*'. Therefore, the specific vegetable origin, be it coconut, soy, sunflower, palm or any other vegetable oil, has to be indicated even if the designation '*vegetable oils*' is used. According to Article 55 of the FIR, the new rules enter into force on the 20th day following its publication in the Official Journal of the European Union and apply from 13 December 2014, with certain exceptions. Therefore, as of 13 December 2014, the vegetable origin of oils, including palm oil, has to be indicated in the list of ingredients.

The first harmonised EU food labelling rules in *Council Directive 79/112/EEC of 18 December 1978 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs for sale to the ultimate consumer* (*i.e.*, the predecessor of Directive 2000/13/EC) established the possibility to use the category name '*vegetable oil*'. The category name was deemed necessary to ensure certain flexibility in the formulations, allowing for the variation in the sourcing and utilisation of the raw material. Different vegetable oils and fats are indeed inter-changeable and inter-changed, depending on seasonal and market availability and price. The category name '*vegetable oils*' was also considered necessary to guarantee the confidentiality of certain oil and fat formulations for specific food applications. The changes to the labelling rules for vegetable oils established in the FIR will inevitably lead (as recognised by the Council itself) to higher manufacturing and labelling costs due to the frequent changes in the composition of products, which need to be reflected in the labels. These costs will most likely be passed on to consumers.

It also remains to be seen what impact the new labelling regime under the FIR might have on the current '*free-from*' campaigns, which are increasingly being waged against palm oil, but also against coconut oil and other vegetable oils for alleged nutritional and environmental

reasons. These campaigns appear to be, at best, deceptive or unsubstantiated generalisations and, at worst, fraudulent in nature and aimed at denigrating competing oils and/or promoting certain products by implying that whatever is used as an ingredient is better, healthier or environmentally greener than what is not used. In fact, for instance, when made in a nutritional context, these '*free-from*' labels are arguably not approved and, therefore, illegal nutrition claims under *Regulation (EC) No. 1924/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of on nutrition and health claims made on foods* and/or misleading and deceptive claims under Directive 2000/13/EC and *Directive 2006/114/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning misleading and comparative advertising*. Similarly, the environmental allegations are always unsubstantiated generalisations in that not all vegetable oil contained in a specific product and being discouraged or denigrated with the negative labels is environmentally unsustainable.

By making it compulsory that the oil origin be specified (so that a consumer can make an informed choice in the selection of food products), a mere look at the list of ingredients will tell consumers whether a product contains a specific vegetable oil or not. '*Free-from certain oils*' campaigns directly on the products packaging should, therefore, be seen not only as illegal or deceptive (as argued above), but also unnecessary in the near future, since any consumer will be able to tell what vegetable oil is present or not in any food product. There will be no need to use these dubious '*free-from certain oils*' campaigns in order to '*help*' consumers make informed choices. However, it is possible (and perhaps even likely, given the '*hidden agendas*' that these campaigns pursue) that such harmful and misleading information campaigns, based on the skilful use of '*free-from*' labels, may still be addressed at consumers. Authorities and commercial operators need to closely scrutinise the market and challenge these anti-competitive practices. The expectation is that EU authorities and EU Member States will take labelling seriously and, while they impose costly new rules on producers, they also ensure that consumers are not misled by astute marketing techniques that have no informative agenda, but simply aim at denigrating certain vegetable oils in order to promote others or to convince consumers that what is '*free*' from a certain oil is a better product.

Russia requests WTO consultations with the EU concerning the EU's *Third Energy Package*

On 30 April 2014, Russia tabled a request for WTO consultations with the EU concerning certain measures enshrined in the latter's *Third Energy Package* (*i.e.*, an energy policy adopted in 2009 aimed at, *inter alia*, promoting sustainability and competition within the EU's gas and electricity markets). It appears that the controversial measures would negatively affect *Gazprom*'s (*i.e.*, the Russian State-owned gas company) ability to exercise control over its pipeline assets in the EU's territory.

In its request for consultations, Russia alleges that the EU's *Third Energy Package* foresees three main measures that are particularly contrary to WTO law, *i.e.*: (i) an '*unbundling*' requirement of vertically-integrated undertakings involved in the production, supply and transmission of natural gas and electricity; (ii) discriminatory certification requirements that apply solely in relation to third countries; and (iii) certain requirements forcing transmission service operators to grant access of third parties to natural gas and electricity network capacities.

Broadly, the EU's *Third Energy Package* (particularly, *Directive 2009/73/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 concerning common rules for the internal market in natural gas and repealing Directive 2003/55/EC*) envisages that companies '*unbundle*' (*i.e.*, separate) their production and supply activities. This may be achieved by means of three schemes, *i.e.*, (a) the '*ownership unbundling*' (where ownership of energy

production is separated from ownership of transmission activities); (b) an '*Independent System Operator*' (where both activities may be carried out by a vertically-integrated company, provided that the management of the transmission network's technical and commercial operations is entrusted to a company under distinct ownership); or (c) an '*Independent Transmission Operator*' (where both activities may be carried out by a vertically-integrated company, provided that specific independency requirements apply to the transmission subsidiary and it is subject to additional controls).

In addition, the EU's measures foresee that EU and third-country companies wishing to acquire a significant interest over an EU network seek certification from national regulators in the relevant EU Member States prior to operating. Apart from complying with the '*unbundling*' requirements that apply to EU operators, non-EU companies are required to comply with the so-called '*third country clause*', which establishes that certification to operate in the EU may be refused where it is considered that such certification would threaten the security of energy supply in the EU. In its request for WTO consultations, Russia also points at the EU's requirements that transmission system operators grant third parties non-discriminatory access (on the basis of regulated tariffs) to natural gas and electricity network capacities. Russia also alleges that, in relation to all three issues, the EU's measures envisage the possibility that exemptions and derogations be granted on a case-by-case basis, which stands to unduly favour certain infrastructures, operators and amounts of transported gas. In Russia's view, these measures are overly-burdensome and result in discrimination, in a manner that is contrary to the EU's WTO obligations.

In particular, Russia argues that the aforementioned measures within the EU's *Third Energy Package* are inconsistent with certain provisions under a number of WTO Agreements, most notably under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (hereinafter, GATS), the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter, GATT), the Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (hereinafter, ASCM) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (hereinafter, TRIMs Agreement).

Russia submits that the EU's measures are inconsistent with, *inter alia*, the most-favoured nation (hereinafter, MFN) and national treatment obligations codified in Article II and Article XVII of the GATS, respectively, as well as with the provision on market access embedded in Article XVI of the GATS. While the MFN treatment obligation applies to all measures concerning trade in services, Articles XVI and XVII of the GATS clarify that WTO Members are only obliged to extend market access commitments and national treatment to other WTO Members with respect to those service sectors inscribed in their Schedule of Commitments.

Although energy services are not classified as a separate sector under the WTO, commitments on energy-related services are scheduled under services incidental to mining, services incidental to energy distribution and pipeline transportation of fuels. However, the EU does not appear to have undertaken specific commitments in such sectors, meaning that the EU does not appear bound to grant market access and national treatment conditions equivalent to those that apply to its domestic operators. This may be particularly relevant in relation to the assessment of the EU's energy security under the '*third country clause*', which applies to third-country operators only (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 18 of 5 October 2012).

Russia also submits that the EU is in violation of its obligations relevant to trade in goods under the GATT. According to Russia, the EU's measures are inconsistent with the EU's MFN and national treatment obligations and constitute a quantitative restriction in violation of Article XI of the GATT. Moreover, Russia deems that the EU has failed to comply with WTO requirements relating to the publication and administration of trade regulations, as envisaged by Article X of the GATT. These claims are completed by the allegations under Article 2 of the TRIMs Agreement, which requires that WTO Members ensure that their investment

measures related to trade in goods not contradict the provisions on national treatment and quantitative restrictions under Articles III and XI of the GATT.

Finally, Russia appears to consider that the EU's measures amount to a prohibited subsidy under the WTO, maintaining that certain EU's measures constitute a '*subsidy*' within the meaning of the ASCM, which is either '*contingent...upon export performance*' or '*contingent...upon the use of domestic over imported goods*'.

Arguably, the timing of Russia's request for consultations is not casual. In December 2013, the EU Commission indicated that the inter-governmental agreements concluded between Russia and a number of EU Member States (*i.e*., Austria, Bulgaria, Croatia, Greece, Hungary and Slovenia) and Serbia, underpinning the construction of the *Gazprom*-favoured South Stream pipeline (which would run under the Black Sea and supply gas to certain parts of the EU, by-passing Ukraine) were in breach of EU law and, therefore, had to be re-negotiated. According to the EU Commission, the seven agreements (as they currently stand) would render the South Stream pipeline contrary to the EU's *Third Energy Package* in that: (i) by owning both the gas to be exported and the transmission network, *Gazprom* would be both a producer and a supplier of gas, in contravention of the '*unbundling*' requirements; (ii) *Gazprom* would remain the sole gas shipper, not allowing for the mandatory non-discriminatory access of third parties to the pipeline; and (iii) the proposed tariff structure (particularly the link between oil and gas prices) would not be in line with EU law. Reportedly, the EU Commission clarified that, regardless of the possibility of exemptions and derogations foreseen in the EU's *Third Energy Package*, the South Stream project needed to comply with the EU's relevant regulatory framework upfront.

Apart from this, in September 2012 the EU Commission confirmed that it had initiated proceedings to establish whether *Gazprom* engaged in anti-competitive practices in the EU. In particular, the EU Commission investigated whether a number of suspected practices (*i.e.*, that *Gazprom* may have divided gas markets by hindering the free flow of gas across EU Member States; that *Gazprom* may have prevented the diversification of gas supply; and that *Gazprom* may have imposed unfair prices on its customers by linking oil and gas prices) amounted to a restriction of competition in breach of the EU's antitrust rules.

Although the EU Commission reportedly indicated that such antitrust proceedings have been temporarily put on hold, the EU Commission's findings that the seven inter-governmental agreements need to be re-negotiated certainly add to what is already becoming a spiral of commercial confrontations between Russia and the EU. The two trading partners have recently triggered various dispute settlement procedures against each other at the WTO, notably concerning Russian fees on vehicles (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 20 of 31 October 2013) and a Russian alleged import ban related to the African swine fever outbreak in the EU (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 8 of 17 April 2014), as well as the imposition of anti-dumping duties by the EU and its related cost adjustment methodologies. This acceleration in the recourse to WTO dispute settlement illustrates, once more, the reliability that this mechanism has earned among WTO Members, which reach out to it when in need of a system that, unlike other schemes of dubious effectiveness, impartially determines whether the general rules of multilateral trade have been complied with or not. Businesses are among the primary beneficiaries of such frequent recourse, inasmuch as WTO dispute settlement ensures that concerns alien to those strictly related to WTO-compliance will not be taken into account. In this light, both EU and Russian companies affected by the consultations requested by Russia against the EU's *Third Energy Package* should be vigilant and ensure that their interests are duly represented at the relevant instances within the various steps of the WTO procedure that is about to unfold.

Privacy and electronic commerce issues addressed in the most recent Trans-Pacific Partnership negotiations

On 12 May 2014, the latest negotiating round for the Trans-Pacific Partnership (hereinafter, TPP) agreement started in Vietnam. Reports indicate that the US recently made proposals regarding the electronic commerce chapter of the agreement. Privacy and electronic commerce issues have gained exposure as of late, especially in the international trade arena, and the final text of the TPP on these issues may have an effect on the negotiations of future trade agreements.

The TPP expands and amends the Trans-Pacific Strategic Economic Partnership Agreement (hereinafter, P4) signed by Brunei Darussalam, Chile, New Zealand and Singapore in 2005. In addition to the original P4 members, the 8 other TPP members now include Australia, Canada, Japan, Malaysia, Mexico, Peru, the US and Vietnam (for more information, see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 22 of 29 November 2013). Recent comments by officials suggest that the TPP negotiations may be nearing conclusion. In fact, leading up to the negotiations in Vietnam, the TPP parties were so optimistic that they even tentatively scheduled a Ministerial meeting in Singapore for 19-20 May 2014, with the intention that the agreement be signed there. The biggest issue that parties reportedly hoped to resolve during this round of negotiations appears to be related to market access concessions between the US and Japan. Nonetheless, the Office of the United States Trade Representative (hereinafter, USTR) has indicated that negotiations in Vietnam were intended to address a range of issues, including, *inter alia*, intellectual property, investment, environment and textiles. Arguably, the most intriguing issues likely being addressed in Vietnam pertain to the electronic commerce chapter. Sources indicate that, prior to the negotiations, the US proposed a new text on the free flow of information across borders and the prohibition of any local server requirements.

These "*twenty-first century issues*" were recently discussed by a USTR negotiator at a panel discussion in Washington, D.C. The negotiator specified that US objectives in the TPP include ensuring that all parties have the right to move information across borders and that businesses not be required to build servers in every country in which they operate. The intention being that these policies will promote the development of global networks that support innovation and creativity, while also supporting the US industry. The proposals also come on the heels of the USTR's annual Report of the 1377 Review (*i.e.*, the "*1377 Review*", a yearly report detailing the operation and effectiveness of telecommunications trade agreements pursuant to Section 1377 of the US Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988). The 1377 Review, released on 2 April 2014, pointed to new and potential barriers to trade in the area of electronic commerce including, *inter alia*, an EU proposal to create an EU-only cloud computing network, the blocking of numerous internet services in Turkey (*e.g.*, *Twitter* and *YouTube*), restrictions to voice-over the Internet services (*i.e.*, "*VOIP*") in China and India, as well as potential local data requirements and equipment standards in Brazil and Indonesia. The US has been addressing these types of issues in international trade agreements for over 10 years, with the result that ten of its free trade agreements currently include chapters addressing electronic commerce. However, more recently, questions have been raised regarding the balance between limiting trade barriers relating to electronic commerce and potential security and privacy concerns.

Opponents of provisions requiring the free flow of information across borders and prohibitions on local server requirements argue that these types of policies may interfere with individuals' right to privacy. In particular, residents of some countries may not want sensitive data pertaining to taxes, healthcare or personal finances to travel across borders. In Canada, some provinces (such as British Columbia and Nova Scotia) have already addressed these issues domestically, requiring that personal information remain in the custody of a public body and be stored and accessed only in Canada. Reportedly, Australia

is concerned that accepting the US proposals may conflict with its national privacy laws and regulations for off-shored personal data. Additionally, a Malaysian consumer association has voiced its opposition to provisions requiring the free flow of information or prohibiting any local server requirements. The association has warned that these types of provisions would facilitate intelligence gathering and spying by foreign governments, a practice that has received increased attention in the media. One position is that, depending on which country the data is stored in, government agencies may have varying abilities of access that data due to domestic regulations and standards, which may allow for court orders or other modes of access to information with less scrutiny. As a result, the final TPP text may include exceptions to the free flow of information or rule on when data can be required to stay stored locally.

These issues are important for economic, security and individual rights-related reasons. Although the debate will likely continue beyond the TPP's conclusion, the agreed text may serve as a benchmark for future agreements, given how recent attention to the subject may have shaped negotiations. For instance, the EU has maintained that it does not want to address data privacy in the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (hereinafter, TTIP) currently being negotiated with the US, including through a March 2014 vote by the EU Parliament in favour of withholding consent for the TTIP if it does not fully respect EU data privacy rules. However, recent reports also indicate that the US has proposed text in the electronic commerce chapter of the TTIP agreement to prohibit measures that require local data storage, while EU officials, for their part, have reportedly stated that they are prepared to discuss issues relating to the flow of data across borders. Businesses should monitor these developments, as local data storage requirements have the potential to impose significant costs to international companies. A difficult balancing act must be struck and perhaps the solution to this matter rests both in trade negotiations and technological advances.

The EU adopted a framework to better enforce its rights under international trade agreements

On 8 May 2014, the EU Council adopted a regulation that creates a common legislative framework, which will empower the EU Commission to take swifter action when enforcing the EU's rights under international trade agreements. This streamlined process has been long overdue since the passage of the Lisbon Treaty and should be welcomed by EU businesses.

Prior to the entry into force of the Treaty of Lisbon in 2009, the EU enforced its rights under international trade agreements through the EU Council's adoption of regulations on a case-by-case basis, following proposals by the EU Commission. There was no single framework for the EU to defend its rights and the process could take over a year. In December 2010, the EU Commission endorsed a communication that set objectives for the EU to improve its ability to enforce its rights under bilateral and multilateral agreements. The communication led to the adoption by the EU Commission, on 18 December 2012, of a '*Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the exercise of the Union's rights for the application and enforcement of international trade rules*' (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 1 of 11 January 2013). On 2 April 2014, the EU Parliament approved an amended version of the EU Commission's proposal. On 8 May 2014, the EU Council endorsed the amended text, which will enter into force on the twentieth day following its publication in the *Official Journal of the European Union*.

The approved and endorsed version, titled '*Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the exercise of the Union's rights for the application and enforcement of international trade rules and amending Council Regulation (EC) No 3286/94 laying down*

Community procedures in the field of the common commercial policy in order to ensure the exercise of the Community's rights under international trade rules, in particular those established under the auspices of the World Trade Organization' (hereinafter, the Regulation), applies in 4 situations. According to Article 3(a)-(d) and Article 4(1) of the Regulation, the EU Commission may take action where it is necessary to safeguard the EU's interests if: (a) after the adjudication of a trade dispute, the EU is authorised to suspend concessions or other obligations under agreements covered by the WTO Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes; (b) following the adjudication of a trade dispute under other international trade agreements (*e.g.*, regional or bilateral agreements), the EU has the right to suspend concessions or other obligations; (c) the EU has the right under Article 8 of the WTO Agreement on Safeguards, or similar provisions in other international trade agreements, to rebalance concessions or other obligations; and (d) no compensatory adjustments have been agreed in cases where another WTO Member modifies its concessions under Article XXVIII of the GATT. Limitations for the measures taken under each situation are provided in Article 4(2)(a)-(d) of the Regulation, such as: (a) remedies following the adjudication of a WTO dispute cannot exceed the level authorised by the WTO Dispute Settlement Body; (b) measures taken following adjudication of other international agreement shall not exceed the level of nullification or impairment resulting from the third-country measure; (c) action taken to rebalance concessions or other obligations under safeguard provisions must be '*substantially equivalent*' to those affected by the safeguard measure; and (d) concessions withdrawn following the modification of a WTO Member's schedule under Article XXVIII of the GATT must also be '*substantially equivalent*' to the modified concession. In total, the EU Commission now has the power to increase customs duties, set import quotas or impose limitations on access to public contracts in the EU by means of an executive decision, which should put more pressure on offending third countries to comply with international trade agreements.

Regardless, the most important aspect of the new Regulation is that, as allowed under the Treaty of Lisbon, it establishes a clear and stable framework for the implementation and enforcement of the common commercial policy. The ability of the EU Commission to quickly adopt executive measures should sufficiently ensure EU businesses that the EU Commission now has the ability and the responsibility to effectively enforce rights under international agreements. EU businesses no longer need to worry that they will lose money and commercial opportunities while the (often lengthy) EU legislative process unfolds in the attempt to adopt enforcement measures.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Trade Remedies

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 470/2014 of 13 May 2014 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of solar glass originating in the People's Republic of China*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 488/2014 of 12 May 2014 amending Regulation (EC) No. 1881/2006 as regards maximum levels of cadmium in foodstuffs*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 443/2014 of 30 April 2014 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 543/2011 as regards the trigger*

levels for additional duties on tomatoes, cucumbers, table grapes, apricots, cherries, other than sour, peaches, including nectarines, and plums

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 442/2014 of 30 April 2014 amending Regulation (EC) No. 1235/2008 as regards requests for inclusion in the list of third countries recognised for the purpose of equivalence in relation to the import of organic products*

Other

- *Council Decision of 6 May 2014 on a position to be taken, on behalf of the European Union, within the Trade Committee set up by the Trade Agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Colombia and Peru, of the other part, as regards the adoption of the Rules of Procedure for the Trade Committee, the Rules of Procedure and Code of Conduct for arbitrators, the establishment of the lists of arbitrators and the list of experts of the Group of Experts, and the adoption of the Rules of Procedure for the Group of Experts on Trade and Sustainable Development*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 441/2014 of 30 April 2014 amending Regulation (EC) No. 29/2009 laying down requirements on data link services for the single European sky*

- *Regulation (EU) No. 468/2014 of the European Central Bank of 16 April 2014 establishing the framework for cooperation within the Single Supervisory Mechanism between the European Central Bank and national competent authorities and with national designated authorities (SSM Framework Regulation)*

- *Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) No. 492/2014 of 7 March 2014 supplementing Regulation (EU) No. 528/2012 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the rules for the renewal of authorisations of biocidal products subject to mutual recognition*

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