FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 21 of 18 November 2011

EU ethanol producers have requested that the EU Commission investigate US fuel ethanol subsidies

On 2 November 2011, the European Renewable Ethanol Association (hereinafter, the Ethanol Association) filed a complaint requesting that the EU Commission investigate whether US fuel ethanol exporters have received WTO-illegal subsidies. According to the Ethanol Association, from 2008 to 2010 US exports of fuel ethanol to Europe increased by more than 500%. The Ethanol Association argues that these increased export levels were the result of US subsidies at the Federal and State levels, which have allowed US operators to implement aggressive pricing strategies in the EU market. One example is a tax credit of 45 USD cents per gallon known as the '*Volumetric Ethanol Excise Tax Credit*' (for more background, see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 23 of 20 December 2010). The US also supports the domestic ethanol industry through the '*Small Ethanol Producer Tax Credit*' of 10 USD cents per gallon of ethanol produced.

In recent years, the EU has applied anti-dumping and countervailing duties against imports of other US biofuels. In 2009, the EU published *Regulation (EC) No. 598/2009 of 7 July 2009* and *Regulation (EC) No. 599/2009 of 7 July 2009* which, respectively, imposed '*definitive*' countervailing and anti-dumping duties on imports of US biodiesel for up to 5 years. Earlier this year, these measures were extended to imports of Canadian biodiesel by *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 443/2011 of 5 May 2011* and *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 444/2011 of 5 May 2011*.

The EU Commission must formally open a countervailing duty investigation if the Ethanol Association's complaint reveals sufficient evidence of both countervailable subsidies and injury to an industry of the EU. If the EU Commission's investigation demonstrates that: 1) the imports benefit from a countervailable subsidy; 2) there is injury suffered by the EU industry; 3) there is a causal link between the injury and the subsidised imports; and 4) the imposition of countervailing duties is not against the interests of the EU, then the EU Commission may impose '*provisional*' countervailing duties (*i.e.*, impose an obligation on importers of US fuel ethanol to post security or a bond at importation), for a maximum period of 4 months, provided that the EU Commission acts within 9 months of the initiation of the proceedings. If the EU Commission determines that '*definitive*' countervailing duties are warranted, these must be proposed to the EU Council no later than 1 month before the expiry of the '*provisional*' countervailing duties, and must be imposed by the EU Council within 1 month of the submission of the proposal. '*Definitive*' countervailing duties will expire 5 years from the date of imposition or 5 years from the date of the most recent review which has covered both subsidisation and injury, unless it is determined in a review that the expiry would be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of subsidisation and injury.

To open an anti-dumping investigation, the EU Commission must similarly determine that there is sufficient evidence of dumping and injury. In order to impose '*provisional*' anti-

dumping duties, the EU Commission must determine that: 1) US ethanol producers have engaged in dumping; 2) material injury has been suffered by the EU ethanol industry; 3) there is a causal link between the dumping and injury; and 4) the imposition of anti-dumping measures is not against the EU's interest. The EU Commission can only impose '*provisional'* anti-dumping duties within 9 months of the initiation of the proceedings. If the EU Commission determines that '*definitive'* anti-dumping duties are warranted, they must be imposed by the EU Council within 1 month of the submission of a proposal for '*definitive*' anti-dumping duties by the EU Commission, and this EU Commission proposal must be submitted to the EU Council no later than 1 month before the expiry of the '*provisional*' anti-dumping duties. '*Definitive*' anti-dumping duties may be applied for 5 years from the date of imposition, or 5 years from the date of the conclusion of the most recent review which has covered both dumping and injury, unless it is determined in a review that the expiry of the anti-dumping duties would be likely to lead to a continuation or recurrence of both dumping and injury.

It must be noted that a number of procedural aspects related to the adoption of anti-dumping and countervailing duties are set to change once the '*Trade Omnibus I*' regulation is adopted by the EU Parliament and the EU Council. The '*Trade Omnibus I*' proposal (*i.e.*, *Proposal from the European Commission for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council amending certain regulations relating to the common commercial policy as regards the procedures for the adoption of certain measures*, of 7 March 2011) was issued in light of the 1 March 2011 entry into force of the New Comitology Regulation. Required under Article 291 of the TFEU, the so-called '*new comitology rules*' provide the rules and procedures concerning mechanisms for control by EU Member States of the EU Commission's exercise of its implementing powers (for more background, see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 4 of 25 February 2011).

The Ethanol Association's formal complaint could have swift commercial consequences. The EU Commission may begin a formal investigation later this month, and could impose '*provisional*' anti-dumping or countervailing duties on imports of US ethanol as early as 2012. This would have important implications for the global ethanol industry. In 2010, the US and Brazil together produced approximately 88% of the world's ethanol supply, much of it destined for export to the EU – the world's third-largest market for ethanol that year. Price competition from US ethanol imports has reportedly hampered the growth of the EU ethanol industry. If '*provisional*' anti-dumping or countervailing duties are adopted by the EU early next year, they will affect imports of hundreds of millions of litres of fuel ethanol from the US. This may decrease the import volumes of US ethanol into the EU and therefore provide commercial space for EU and other third countries' ethanol producers to expand their production. Should the EU eventually apply '*provisional*' and/or '*definitive*' anti-dumping or countervailing duties against US fuel ethanol imports, negatively-affected parties may nevertheless have several legal recourses against these measures (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 11 of 5 June 2009). Commercial parties with a stake in the EU ethanol or biofuel industries should thus ensure that they are aware of all the commercial and legal issues surrounding a possible EU Commission investigation of US fuel ethanol subsidies.

Peru ready to file a WTO complaint on Brazil's canned sardines technical regulation

The Government of Peru officially announced its intention to file a formal WTO complaint against Brazil with respect to Brazilian description and quality requirements for canned sardines. The measure at issue was adopted through the Ministerial Act of Brazil No. 406 of 10 August 2010. Concerns regarding this technical regulation were already raised by Peru at the WTO Committee on Technical Barriers to Trade (hereinafter, TBT Committee). Following

the discussions at the TBT Committee meeting held on 24 – 25 March 2011, Brazil agreed to hold bilateral consultations with Peru with the view to solve the matter. The reported intention of Peru to file an official WTO complaint appears to indicate that no solution was reached in the course of such bilateral discussions.

According to Peru, its sardines exporters have, for many years, faced difficulties in entering Brazil's market. However, the recent Brazilian Ministerial Act appears to have further exacerbated market access restrictions. Article 3.1 of the new measure has significantly limited the list of species from which canned sardines and sardine-type products must be processed. Most crucially, the new list has omitted the *Engraulis ringens* species, which were included in the previous regulation and which form a substantial part of canned fish exports from Peru to Brazil. According to the new rules, products using *Engraulis ringens* as raw material cannot enter the Brazilian market as sardines, but are allowed entry only as anchovy, a cheaper-marketed commodity. Moreover, Article 5 of the new regulation also denies products prepared from *Engraulis ringens* as being eligible for the use of the name '*Sardines X*' on the marketing label. In support of the excessive and unreasonable nature of the new technical regulation, Peru refers to the Codex Standard for canned sardines and sardines-type products (hereinafter, Codex Stan 94), adopted in 1987 by the Codex Alimentarius Commission of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation and the World Health Organisation. Codex Stan 94, unlike the disputed technical regulation, includes *Engraulis ringens* in the list of 22 species from which canned sardines can be prepared. Furthermore, Codex Stan 94 allows products manufactured from this species to be labelled and marketed as '*Sardines X*'. In Peru's view, the Brazilian measure departs from the relevant international standard – Codex Stan 94 – without explaining why the implementation of an international standard would not suffice for achieving the allegedly legitimate objectives of Brazil. The Minister of Planning and Management of Fisheries of Brazil replied that the measure seeks to secure fair competition and adequate information on the product to be provided to consumers, as otherwise the Government '*would be inducing the consumer into buying something that is not what is offered*'.

This is not the first case brought by Peru to the WTO regarding foreign description and quality regulations for canned sardines. Similar claims were resolved by WTO adjudicators in the *EC – Sardines* case. Though focusing on a different fish species, the previous Peruvian dispute dealt with an EEC Council Regulation establishing the marketing requirements for '*preserved sardines*'. Of utmost importance for the resolution of the dispute were the provisions of the Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (hereinafter, the TBT Agreement). Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement requires WTO Members to refrain from developing technical regulations which create unnecessary obstacles to international trade and are more trade-restrictive than necessary to achieve the legitimate objectives being sought, taking into account the risk that non-fulfilment would create. Moreover, Article 2.4 of the TBT Agreement maintains that, in case relevant international standards exist or their completion is imminent, WTO Members shall use them as a basis for their technical regulations. WTO Members could depart from the existing international standards where these are ineffective or inappropriate to achieve the pursued legitimate objectives. In *EC – Sardines*, the Appellate Body disagreed with the respondent (*i.e.*, the EU) that, in order to be relevant, an international standard should be agreed by consensus. Codex Stan 94 has been found to be a relevant international standard '*bearing upon, relating to, or pertinent to*' the disputed regulation due to the similar product coverage. It appears very likely that the relevance of Codex Stan 94 will be affirmatively established in the new dispute that Peru intends to bring. Taking account of the fact that WTO panels tend to consider consumer protection, market transparency and fair competition as legitimate objectives, the outcome of the dispute will largely depend on a finding of whether Codex Stan 94 on sardine classification is sufficient to achieve Brazil's goals. According to the Appellate Body in *EC – Sardines*, it will be for Peru to demonstrate that Codex Stan 94 is an effective and appropriate means to fulfil the '*legitimate objectives*' being pursued by Brazil.

Peruvian exports of '*sardines*' to Brazil are reported to have amounted to 4 million USD in 2010, prior to the imposition of the new measures. A possible decision in favour of Peru's complaint will open up the market of Brazil for imports of '*sardines*' from Peru as well as from other WTO Members. Brazil, being one of the fastest-growing food consumption markets, is particularly attractive for producers of sardines, highly popular in Brazil, and bearing a steady, long-standing consumption market. An eventual WTO Panel decision in this dispute could also provide helpful guidance on the freedom of states to deviate from international standards in the pursuit of the legitimate objectives of consumer protection and fair competition. This should be of particular relevance for policy makers, regulatory authorities and standardisation bodies in all jurisdictions.

The EU Commission establishes lists of food additives which are permitted in the EU; however, new risk assessments are still to come

On 11 November 2011, the EU Commission adopted two regulations implementing the framework *Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on food additives*, establishing lists of food additives which are permitted in the EU: *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1129/2011 amending Annex II to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008 by establishing an EU list of food additives* and *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1130/2011 amending Annex III to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008 on food additives by establishing an EU list of food additives approved for use in food additives, food enzymes, food flavourings and nutrients.*

Food additives are substances which are added to food for a variety of technical reasons, such as colouring, preservation, stabilising, or sweetening. The authorised uses of food additives are listed according to the category of food to which they may be added (*i.e.*, the new *Annex II to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008*). Under the old EU regulatory system, the lists of additives were spread over several annexes in three different directives (*i.e.*, on sweeteners, on food colours and on additives other than colours and sweeteners) and permitted uses were not always clear. The new EU list clarifies that, for some food categories, there are only very few authorised additives available. For other foodstuffs, such as unflavoured buttermilk and yoghurt, butter, dry pasta, simple bread, honey, natural mineral water, coffee (excluding instant coffee), unflavoured leaf tea, and sugars, additives are not permitted at all. The list of additives that may be added to other additives, enzymes, flavourings and nutrients (*i.e.*, the new *Annex III to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008*) is intended to ensure that exposure to additives through these ingredients remains limited.

The question is whether there are international trade implications with the adoption of the new EU lists of additives. *Regulation (EU) No. 1129/2011* itself states in its introduction that '*[t]he established Codex Alimentarius General Standard for Food Additives (i.e., Codex STAN 192-1995), food category system has been used as a starting point for developing the EU system. However, that system needs to be adapted to take into account the specificity of the existing food additive authorisations in the EU. Current sector specific EU provisions on foods have been taken into account. The categories are created with the sole purpose of listing the authorised additives and their conditions of use'.* Using a Codex Standard as a '*starting point'* implies that the end result will not always be in line with the Codex Standard. For example, certain additives or specific uses of additives in certain categories of foods, which may be permitted under the Codex Standard, may not be permitted in the EU. For instance, fresh fruit must be generally free of additives. However, the surface of fresh fruit may be treated and a number of additives are permitted both under the EU list and under the Codex Standard, such as waxes. In addition to those additives enumerated in the EU list, the Codex Standard also lists, for example, Polyethylene glycol (E 1521) and

Polyvinylpyrrolidone (E 1201) which, in general, are permitted additives in the EU for certain uses, but not for surface treatment of fresh fruit.

Under Article 3(1) of the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (hereinafter, the SPS Agreement), WTO Members are encouraged to use international standards, guidelines and recommendations of the *Codex Alimentarius Commission* (for food safety), where they exist. However, according to Article 3(3) of the SPS Agreement, WTO Members may use measures that result in higher (*i.e.*, stricter) standards if there is scientific justification. WTO Members may also set higher standards based on appropriate assessment of risks, so long as the approach is consistent, and not arbitrary. The question arises whether the differences in the EU lists of additives, *vis-à-vis* the list in the Codex Standard, are scientifically justified. It should also be recalled that the established EU lists are not the result of a new risk assessment. New assessments of the existing additives are still to come. In March 2010, the EU Commission adopted a programme for the re-evaluation of all authorised food additives (*i.e.*, *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 257/2010 of 25 March 2010 setting up a programme for the re-evaluation of approved food additives in accordance with Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008 on food additives*). Under the programme, the European Food Safety Authority must re-evaluate by 2020 all food additives that had been permitted before 20 January 2009. Food colours are first on the priority list, and most of them must be evaluated by the end of 2011. The remaining colours must be evaluated by the end of 2015, and preservatives, antioxidants, glutamates, and silicon dioxide by 2015 - 2016. Due to the availability of new scientific data, priority has been given to the re-assessment of the sweetener aspartame (in relation to aspartame, see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 10 of 20 May 2011), which will be re-evaluated by September 2012. Other sweeteners will be evaluated by the end of 2020 and all other additives by the end of 2018. The risk assessments for '*existing*' additives in the pipeline will potentially lead to further deviations from the Codex Standard on food additives.

In this context, one food additive, which was already authorised earlier this year under the Codex Standard on food additives, has now also received EU approval. The natural sweetener *steviol glycosides* (E 960), derived from the *Stevia ribaudiana* plant (hereinafter, stevia) has been included in Annex II to *Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008* by *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1131/2011 of 11 November 2011*. As of 2 December 2011, stevia will be authorised in the EU in table top sweeteners, certain beers and alcoholic drinks, food supplements, certain sauces, certain dietary foods, and a number of energy-reduced products (*e.g.*, flavoured fermented milk products, ice cream, jams, confectionery, chewing gum, desserts, fruit nectars, and soups).

The adoption by the EU of lists of permitted additives will make it easier for the food industry to know exactly which additives are allowed in the EU, and under which conditions (*i.e.*, in which category of foodstuffs and at which maximum amount). The EU list of additives in foodstuffs (*i.e.*, the new *Annex II to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008)* will come into force in June 2013 (this grace period for the application of the current Annex II to *Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008* was deemed necessary to allow the food industry to adapt to the new rules). The second list on additives in food ingredients (*i.e.*, the new *Annex III to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008*) will apply as of 2 December 2011. In terms of international trade, it should be closely monitored whether the EU, in both its new regulations and future assessments of food additives, adopts a stance which is not in line with international standards on food additives, and whether the EU invokes sufficient scientific justification for it or not.

Japan raises concerns with respect to China's export restrictions on rare earth elements

On 7 November 2011, Japan reportedly raised concerns regarding China's rare earth elements export restrictions before the WTO Council for Trade in Goods. Japan emphasised that China reduced the export quotas for such materials by 40% in 2010 and kept the quotas at the same level in 2011. Rare earth elements are particularly important in the manufacturing processes of high-tech electronics, green energy products and military hardware. Currently, China appears to produce around 95% of the world's rare earth elements and uses both export quotas and taxes to regulate the exportation of these substances. Concerns about China's regulation of rare earths exports have been also loudly voiced by the US (see Trade Perspectives, Issue 1 of 14 January 2011). No formal complaint against China's measures has been filed so far to the WTO.

China's restrictions on rare earths exports have significantly boosted global prices for these substances, making goods produced with the use of these elements in China more competitive on world markets. Both Japan and the US consider these export restrictions to amount to disguised protectionism. Conversely, China claims that its restrictions are in full compliance with the WTO, as they facilitate the conservation of exhaustible natural resources and protect the environment. It should be noted that special rules in respect of export duties by China have been negotiated and agreed during the course of its WTO accession. Paragraph 11.3 of China's Accession Protocol contains specific obligations with respect to export duties. According to this provision, China shall eliminate all taxes and charges applied to exports unless specifically provided for in Annex 6 of the Protocol or applied in conformity with the provisions of Article VIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter, the GATT). There are 84 different products mentioned in Annex 6 of China's Accession Protocol, entitled '*Products Subject to Export Duty*'. Rare earth metals (HS code 280530) are not mentioned in the list and, therefore, could not be subject to export duties or taxes.

In assessing China's rare earths export restrictions, some guidance can be sought from the Panel's findings in the *China – Export Restrictions on Raw Materials* case (see Trade Perspectives, Issue 14 of 15 July 2011). This report is currently being appealed by certain parties to the dispute. The case also addressed both quantitative restrictions and export duties on raw materials, such as bauxite, coke, fluorspar, magnesium, manganese, silicon metal and zinc. The Panel determined that the series of Chinese measures operating in concert '*has resulted in the imposition of a restriction or prohibition on their exportation*' that is inconsistent with Article XI:1 of the GATT. China sought justification for its quantitative restrictions of bauxite under Article XI:2(a), claiming that the restrictions on raw materials were applied temporarily and in order to prevent or relieve critical shortages of this essential product. The Panel rejected the argument, having found that China's restriction on exports of refractory-grade bauxite was in place for at least a decade with no indication of whether restrictions would be lifted should reserves be replenished. The same logic would apply to China's restriction on exports of rare earths.

In the *China – Export Restrictions on Raw Materials* dispute, China also invoked the environmental justifications incorporated in Article XX(b) or XX(g) of the GATT. The panel concluded that China had not met its burden of proving that its restrictions '*relate to the conservation of natural resources*', nor it demonstrated that its export restrictions currently made a material contribution to the objective pursued. China is likely to similarly invoke these provisions in a possible dispute on rare earth elements. The process of mining and producing rare earth elements is highly toxic. Environmental concerns in respect of rare earths production appear more complex than those raised by China in respect of its raw materials restrictions. Therefore, WTO adjudicators may find China's quantitative restrictions

reasonably justified under Article XX(b) or XX(g) of the GATT. In relation to export taxes, the panel in *China – Export Restrictions on Raw Materials* found that additional export duties by China are not subject to the exceptions prescribed by Article XX of the GATT. On the basis of this finding, China would be precluded from invoking the general exceptions clause in respect of export duties on rare earths.

Japan's recent complaint over China's rare earth mineral export restrictions underlines the commercial importance of these substances in many high-tech industries in which developed economies are viewed as having a competitive advantage. These include manufactured products such as wind turbines, catalytic converters for vehicles, nuclear power plant control rods, and aircraft engines. Global prices for certain rare earth elements have reportedly increased by as much as 3000% over the last three years. Yet this trend appears to have recently reversed: prices for some rare earth elements such as lanthanum – used in the oil refining process – have reportedly fallen by as much as two-thirds since August. This may be due to a number of factors, including a decision by Japanese and European companies to shift some operations to China. It remains to be seen whether Japan's vocal criticism at the WTO of China's rare earth element export restrictions accelerates this pricing downshift. Business parties with an interest in the energy sector, mineral importation, electronics production, and the green technology sector should remain informed regarding this important commercial issue.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 3 November 2011 amending Decision 2008/866/EC on emergency measures suspending imports from Peru of certain bivalve molluscs intended for human consumption, as regards its period of application (notified under document C(2011) 7767)*

Trade Remedies

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1164/2011 of 15 November 2011 initiating a review of Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 723/2011 (extending the definitive anti-dumping duty imposed by Council Regulation (EC) No. 91/2009 on imports of certain iron or steel fasteners originating in the People's Republic of China to imports of certain iron or steel fasteners consigned from Malaysia, whether declared as originating in Malaysia or not) for the purposes of determining the possibility of granting an exemption from those measures to one Malaysian exporting producer, repealing the anti-dumping duty with regard to imports from that exporting producer and making imports from that exporting producer subject to registration*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1135/2011 of 9 November 2011 initiating an investigation concerning the possible circumvention of anti-dumping measures imposed by Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 791/2011 on imports of certain open mesh fabrics of glass fibres originating in the People's Republic of China by imports of certain open mesh fabrics of glass fibres consigned from Malaysia, whether declared as originating in Malaysia or not, and making such imports subject to registration*

- *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1138/2011 of 8 November 2011 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain fatty alcohols and their blends originating in India, Indonesia and Malaysia*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1170/2011 of 16 November 2011 refusing to authorise certain health claims made on foods and referring to the reduction of disease risk*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1171/2011 of 16 November 2011 refusing to authorise certain health claims made on foods, other than those referring to the reduction of disease risk and to children's development and health*

- *List of approved facilities for the treatment of foods and food ingredients with ionising radiation in the Member States (According to Article 7(4) of Directive 1999/2/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the approximation of the laws of the Member States concerning foods and food ingredients treated with ionising radiation)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1167/2011 of 15 November 2011 fixing the import duties in the cereals sector applicable from 16 November 2011*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1161/2011 of 14 November 2011 amending Directive 2002/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council, Regulation (EC) No. 1925/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Regulation (EC) No. 953/2009 as regards the lists of mineral substances that can be added to foods*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1163/2011 of 14 November 2011 amending the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector fixed by Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 971/2011 for the 2011/12 marketing year*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1129/2011 of 11 November 2011 amending Annex II to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council by establishing a Union list of food additives*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1130/2011 of 11 November 2011 amending Annex III to Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008 of the European Parliament and of the Council on food additives by establishing a Union list of food additives approved for use in food additives, food enzymes, food flavourings and nutrients*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1137/2011 of 9 November 2011 amending the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector fixed by Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 971/2011 for the 2011/12 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1132/2011 of 8 November 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No. 798/2008 as regards transit of*

consignments of eggs and egg products from Belarus through Lithuania to the Russian territory of Kaliningrad

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1114/2011 of 4 November 2011 repealing Regulation (EC) No. 601/2008 on protective measures applying to certain fishery products imported from Gabon and intended for human consumption*

Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights

- *Council Decision of 20 October 2011 on the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Union and the Swiss Confederation on the protection of designations of origin and geographical indications for agricultural products and foodstuffs, amending the Agreement between the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on trade in agricultural products*

- *Agreement between the European Union and the Swiss Confederation on the protection of designations of origin and geographical indications for agricultural products and foodstuffs, amending the Agreement between the European Community and the Swiss Confederation on trade in agricultural products*

Other

- *Council Decision of 8 November 2011 on the conclusion, on behalf of the European Union, of the 2006 International Tropical Timber Agreement*

- *Council Decision of 8 November 2011 on the conclusion of the Agreement between the European Union and the Republic of Cape Verde on certain aspects of air services*

Ignacio Carreño, Eugenia Laurenza, Anna Martelloni, Nicholas Richards-Bentley, Vladimir V. Talanov and Paolo R. Vergano contributed to this issue.