FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 13 of 1 July 2011

The WTO Appellate Body upholds the panel's ruling in *Thailand - Cigarettes from the Philippines*

On 17 June 2011, the WTO Appellate Body issued its final report in the case *Thailand - Customs and Fiscal Measures on Cigarettes from the Philippines* (hereinafter, *Thailand - Cigarettes*). The dispute was initially launched by the Philippines with a request for WTO consultations on 7 February 2008. The Philippines claimed that a number of Thai fiscal and customs measures negatively affected imports of cigarettes from the Philippines, in violation of Thailand's WTO commitments. The Philippines argued, *inter alia*, that Thailand's value-added tax regime (hereinafter, VAT) violated Article III:2 of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter, GATT), which prohibits WTO Members from imposing, directly or indirectly, internal taxes or internal charges in excess of those applied directly or indirectly to '*like*' domestic products. The Philippines further claimed that Thailand's VAT regime was inconsistent with Article III:4 of the GATT, which requires WTO Members to provide national treatment to imported products, which are '*like*' to domestic products, in respect of all laws, regulations and requirements affecting, *inter alia*, their internal sale and distribution. The Philippines also argued that Thailand had acted inconsistently with Article X:3(b) of the GATT by failing to provide a prompt review of its customs guarantee decisions. The Panel concluded that Thailand had violated Articles III:2 and III:4 of the GATT in that the Thai VAT was structured and administered in a way that resulted in taxes and administrative requirements on imported cigarettes that were in excess of those applied to '*like*' domestic cigarettes. The Panel also upheld the Philippines' argument that Thailand had violated Article X:3(b) of the GATT. Thailand appealed these findings.

The Appellate Body first upheld the Panel's finding that Thailand had acted inconsistently with the first sentence of Article III:2 of the GATT '*by subjecting imported cigarettes to VAT liability in excess of that applied to like domestic cigarettes*' through a VAT exemption for re-sales of domestic cigarettes. The Philippines' complaint concerned a Thai measure whereby re-sellers of domestic cigarettes were exempt from VAT. Re-sellers of imported cigarettes, however, did not necessarily enjoy this privilege. The Thai measures imposed VAT on re-sellers of imported cigarettes when they did not satisfy certain conditions for receiving tax credits required to achieve zero VAT liability. The Appellate Body upheld the Panel's conclusion that re-sellers of domestic cigarettes were *de jure* exempt from VAT liability, while re-sellers of imported cigarettes did not automatically receive tax credits to exempt them from VAT liability, and it confirmed that this disparity constituted a violation of Article III:2 of the GATT.

The Appellate Body also upheld the Panel's conclusion that, as a result of certain administrative requirements, Thailand had violated its GATT Article III:4 national treatment obligations. The Panel had concluded that re-sellers of domestic cigarettes were exempted from three sets of VAT-related administrative requirements, while re-sellers of imported cigarettes were not exempted from these administrative requirements. The Appellate Body first rejected Thailand's claim that the Panel's findings and analysis of less favourable

treatment were insufficiently grounded in law to support a conclusion that Thailand had violated Article III:4 of the GATT. The Appellate Body found that the Panel had sufficiently examined the '*fundamental thrust and effect of the measure itself*' in order to justify its conclusion. However, due to an error in the Panel's cross-referencing to another section of its report, the Appellate Body overturned the Panel's rejection of Thailand's GATT Article XX(d) defence. This provision provides a general GATT exemption for measures which are necessary to ensure compliance with laws or regulations that are not, themselves, inconsistent with the GATT. Yet, the Appellate Body completed the Panel's Article XX(d) analysis, focusing – pursuant to the Article XX(d) '*necessity test*' developed in previous Article XX(d) jurisprudence – on whether Thailand's regulatory measures were '*necessary*' to secure compliance with '*laws or regulations*' that are not themselves GATT-inconsistent. The Appellate Body rejected Thailand's Article XX(d) defence, noting that Thailand's submission to the Panel comprised just six paragraphs justifying its additional administrative requirements imposed on importers of cigarettes, and provided little or no elaboration of the necessary elements of its asserted defence under Article XX(d) of the GATT. The Appellate Body concluded that several of Thailand's arguments were '*patently underdeveloped*', and that Thailand ultimately failed to make even a *prima facie* defence under Article XX(d) of the GATT. Thus, the Appellate Body found that Thailand failed to establish that its additional VAT-related administrative requirements imposed on cigarette importers could be justified under Article XX(d) of the GATT.

Finally, the Appellate Body upheld the Panel's finding that Thailand acted inconsistently with Article X:3(b) of the GATT '*by failing to maintain or institute independent review tribunals or procedures for the prompt review of guarantee decisions*'. Thailand's customs procedures required importers to provide a guarantee in order to secure from customs authorities the release of goods prior to a final determination of customs value. The Appellate Body concluded that the Panel was correct in finding that Thailand's customs procedures did not permit guarantee decisions to be challenged until after a final assessment of customs duty had been made. These customs procedures did not ensure the possibility of a prompt review and correction of a relevant administrative act, and were therefore incompatible with Thailand's obligations under Article X:3(b) of the GATT.

The Appellate Body's report in *Thailand - Cigarettes* emphasises the fact that, when analysing arguments made under Article III of the GATT, WTO dispute settlement panels will carefully scrutinise whether a challenged measure has adversely modified the conditions of competition between '*like*' imported and domestic products, rather than whether a challenged measure has actually caused imports to decline. Thus, even a '*theoretical possibility*' that a measure challenged under Article III could negatively affect the competitive position of an imported product may be grounds to uphold a WTO challenge. In this manner, *Thailand - Cigarettes* could be viewed as a '*win*' for exporters worldwide that have encountered (or may be encountering) trade barriers relating to discriminatory internal taxation, regulations, or administrative procedures applied by importing countries. *Thailand - Cigarettes* serves as an important reminder for trading parties (including businesses, despite their inability to bring direct challenges of governmental measures to the WTO) not to hesitate from having recourse to the mechanisms of the WTO to resolve instances in which trade obstacles affect the conditions of competition between imported and domestic '*like*' products.

The EU Commission introduces the '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposal to reform trade policy decision-making

The EU has recently taken steps to reform the process through which it adopts trade policy decisions. On 15 June 2011, the EU Commission introduced a legislative proposal,

COM(2011) 349 final of 15 June 2011 (hereinafter, the '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposal), which reviews whether trade policy procedures currently based on *Council Decision of 28 June 1999 laying down the procedures for the exercise of implementing powers conferred on the Commission* (hereinafter, the 1999 Comitology Decision) should be converted into delegated powers for the EU Commission. Obtaining delegated powers from the EU Parliament and the EU Council would empower the EU Commission to adopt non-legislative acts of general application in order to supplement or amend certain non-essential elements of legislative trade acts.

The '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposal has been presented in order to adapt to a number of changes, introduced by the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter, the TFEU), in the EU Commission's legislative role in the field of EU trade policy. According to Article 207(2) of the TFEU, EU trade policy is made by joint decisions of the EU Council and the EU Parliament according to the ordinary legislative procedure (*i.e.*, '*co-decision*'). This means that, as a result of the TFEU reforms, the EU Parliament is now fully involved in trade policy decision-making. Under the ordinary legislative procedure, legislative proposals must be submitted by the EU Commission to both the EU Council and the EU Parliament for deliberation and approval by the latter two bodies. Pursuant to Article 294 of the TFEU, for a proposal of the EU Commission to be formally adopted, an agreement must be reached between the EU Council and the EU Parliament. International trade agreements are adopted by the EU Council after the EU Parliament has granted its consent.

In addition to setting out the ordinary legislative procedure, the TFEU also introduced changes in the framework for the adoption of '*delegated*' and '*implementing*' acts. Article 290 of the TFEU outlines the possibility of delegating to the EU Commission the power of adopting non-legislative acts of general application to supplement or amend certain non-essential elements of an existing legislative act. These powers are known as '*delegated*' acts. This delegation may be subject to specific conditions, such as a limitation that the delegation may be revoked, or that its exercise in specific circumstances may be objected to by the EU Parliament or EU Council. Article 291 of the TFEU creates the possibility of conferring '*implementing*' powers to the EU Commission in situations in which uniform conditions for implementing legally binding EU laws are required, such as in the case of adoption of anti-dumping measures. The exercise of implementing powers by the EU Commission is controlled by EU Member States as per *Regulation (EU) No. 182/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 February 2011 laying down the rules and general principles concerning mechanisms for control by Member States of the Commission's exercise of implementing powers* (hereinafter, the New Comitology Regulation).

In light of these recent legal changes, the '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposal, as well as an initial reform proposal known as *COM(2011)82 final of 7 March 2011* (hereinafter, the '*Trade Omnibus I*' proposal), have been presented by the EU Commission. The '*Trade Omnibus I*' proposal reviewed certain regulations related to the common commercial policy, involving procedures *not* currently *based* on the 1999 Comitology Decision, in order to determine whether these procedures should be converted into delegated acts pursuant to Article 290 of the TFEU, or implementing acts pursuant to Article 291 of the TFEU. The '*Trade Omnibus I*' proposal 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 '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposal is the second step in this legislative reform process. The proposal reviews whether procedures which *are* currently based on the 1999 Comitology Decision should be converted into delegated powers. The '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposal

examines all of the remaining decision-making procedures found in trade policy legislation (*i.e.*, decision-making procedures not examined within the framework of the '*Trade Omnibus I*' proposal) in order to adapt them, where suitable, to the new regime for delegated acts set out in Article 290 of the TFEU. The '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposal examines 14 regulations in total, including, *inter alia*, *Council Regulation (EEC) No. 3030/93 of 12 October 1993 on common rules for imports of certain textile products from third countries*, *Council Regulation (EC) No. 953/2003 of 26 May 2003 to avoid trade diversion into the European Union of certain key medicines*, and *Council Regulation (EC) No. 732/2008 of 22 July 2008 applying a scheme of generalised tariff preferences for the period from 1 January 2009 to 31 December 2011 and amending Regulations (EC) No. 552/97, (EC) No. 1933/2006 and Commission Regulations (EC) No. 1100/2006 and (EC) No. 964/2007* (hereinafter, the GSP Regulation. See Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 9 of 6 May 2011 for more background on the EU's GSP regime). The EU Commission has proposed, for instance, that Article 10(2) of the GSP Regulation be amended to empower the EU Commission to adopt delegated acts in order to grant access to the GSP+ scheme (*i.e.*, a scheme which grants reductions in EU tariffs for certain exports from selected countries which meet a range of sustainable development and good governance benchmarks).

The '*Trade Omnibus I*' and '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposals may have concrete implications for commercial parties. Both proposals are now being discussed within the EU Council and EU Parliament according to the ordinary legislative procedure. Once adopted, the '*Trade Omnibus I*' and '*Trade Omnibus II*' legislative proposals will lead to a substantial number of amendments to a series of legislative acts in the field of EU trade policy, and will likely increase the power of the EU Commission to supplement or amend existing EU trade legislation. This may have practical consequences for traders. For example, the '*Trade Omnibus I*' proposal suggests changes to several important trade remedy regulations, including the EU's basic anti-dumping regulation (*i.e.*, *Council Regulation (EC) No. 1225/2009 of 30 November 2009 on protection against dumped imports from countries not members of the European Community*), which would be amended to, *inter alia*, double from 3 months to 6 months the period of time the EU Commission is permitted to determine whether a third-party producer operates under market economy conditions. Business actors in the EU should be proactive, and plan ahead to ensure that they remain informed regarding how the *Trade Omnibus I*' and '*Trade Omnibus II*' proposals could affect their trading interests.

The EU Commission proposes substantial changes to the regulatory framework for dietetic foods

Foods for particular nutritional uses (*i.e.*, dietetic foods) are foods that differ from foods for normal consumption in that they are specially manufactured products intended to satisfy the particular nutritional requirements of specific groups of the population. On 20 June 2011, the EU Commission published its *Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the EU Council on food intended for infants and young children and on food for special medical purposes*. The new proposal will repeal *Directive 2009/39/EC on foodstuffs intended for particular nutritional uses* (the so-called '*framework directive on dietetic foods*'), *Directive 92/52/EC on infant formulae and follow-on formulae intended for export to third countries*, *Directive 96/8/EC on foods intended for use in energy-restricted diets for weight reduction*, and *Regulation (EC) No. 41/2009 on the composition and labelling of foodstuffs suitable for people intolerant to gluten*.

The framework directive, of which the majority of the provisions date back to 1977, sets out general rules on the composition and presentation of foods that are specially designed to meet the particular nutritional requirements of the persons to whom they are intended. The

general composition and labelling requirements laid down in the framework directive are currently complemented by a number of rules that are applicable to specific categories of food: *Directive 2006/141/EC on infant formulae and follow-on formulae*, *Directive 2006/125/EC on processed cereal-based foods and baby foods for infants and young children*, *Directive 96/8/EC*, *Directive 1999/21/EC on dietary foods for special medical purposes*, and *Regulation (EC) No. 41/2009*. Although originally foreseen to be introduced, specific rules for '*foods intended to meet the expenditure of intense muscular effort, especially for sportsmen*' and for foods for people suffering from diabetes, have never been established.

Under the EU Commission's new proposal, the concept of '*dietetic foods*' is now abandoned. However, the existing compositional and labelling rules applicable to infant and follow-on *formulae*, processed cereal-based foods and other baby foods, and foods for special medical purposes, are maintained. Furthermore, the proposal establishes a single EU list of substances (instead of the existing three) that may be added to these foods, including, among others, minerals and vitamins. Specific rules for sports foods are not deemed necessary. The same applies to foods for people with diabetes. According to the EU Commission, these people should be able to meet their dietary needs by choosing appropriate foods intended for the general population. In particular, the framework directive currently requires a general notification procedure at the EU Member State level for food presented by food business operators as falling under the definition of '*foodstuffs for particular nutritional uses*', and for which no specific provisions are laid down in EU law. If a manufacturer places a new dietetic food on the EU market (*e.g.*, a '*sports food*'), this action must be notified to the relevant national authority. The designation under which a dietetic food is sold must also be accompanied by a suitability statement for the particular nutritional use and the specific group of the population for which the food is intended.

Under the proposed new framework, however, certain dietetic foods, such as gluten-free food, slimming food and sports foods, will be solely covered by other existing legislation, like *Regulation (EC) No. 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims*, and/or *Regulation (EC) No. 1925/2006 on the addition of vitamins, minerals and other substances to foods*. An example of the consequences is as follows: currently, the statements '*gluten-free*' and '*very low gluten*' may be used for food intended for particular nutritional uses and for food for normal consumption under the rules specified in *Commission Regulation (EC) No. 41/2009 concerning the composition and labelling of foodstuffs suitable for people intolerant to gluten*. The EU Commission now argues that such statements could be construed as nutritional claims, as defined in *Regulation (EC) No. 1924/2006*, and should be regulated solely by *Regulation (EC) No. 1924/2006*, and thus comply with the requirements therein. In this context, the EU Commission argues that the concept of dietetic foods must be abolished to close loopholes in existing EU legislation and to limit the possibility for companies to do '*legislative shopping*' (*i.e.*, select the piece of legislation they prefer, thus circumventing important rules). The EU Commission claims that current EU legislation on dietetic foods is being used by some companies to circumvent stricter EU legislation on nutrition and health claims.

Specialised '*normal*' foods have increasingly been targeting sub-groups of the general population (*e.g.*, protein bars supporting muscle building for sportspeople, food supplements for pregnant women, fortified food in calcium, vitamin D suitable for older adults, and slimming products, *etc.*). Consequently, the EU Commission has stated that the difference between '*dietetic foods*' for specific groups of the population, and '*specialised foods*' for the general population or sub-groups, is no longer clear for citizens, stakeholders, and enforcement authorities. The Association of the Food Industries for Particular Nutrition Uses of the EU (hereinafter, IDACE) has indicated that it regrets that the EU Commission's proposal abolishes the category of dietetic foods and proposes that they become '*general*' foods. According to IDACE, this will remove the special protection for vulnerable consumers.

IDACE argues that general food law alone is not adequate to provide food safety and health protection for vulnerable consumers, which have special and unique nutritional needs. In criticising this proposed change, IDACE has argued that *'[t]he existing dietetic food legislation has provided for more than 35 years of specialist and strictly regulated foods for infants, young children, the obese and overweight, the malnourished (medical nutrition), food allergic and intolerant (e.g. celiac disease patients), and athletes*'.

The EU Commission states that no products will have to be withdrawn from the market as a result of the new rules. Those covered by the dietetic food legislation can remain on the market, but will have to comply with other pieces of existing food legislation. In other words, foods other than infant and baby foods, and foods for special medical purposes that would previously have been classified as dietetic, will be treated as normal foods, unless they make a health or nutrition claim, in which case they would have to submit a dossier supporting the claim to the European Food Safety Authority. In order to facilitate the adaptation of products and reduce costs for operators, mainly in terms of re-labelling, a two-year transitional period is foreseen. The proposal will now be submitted to the EU Parliament and the EU Council. It is foreseen that a new regulation will be in force by the end of 2012. This proposed legislation looks poised to become a further issue of contention in a sector already heavily targeted by EU reforms and regulatory changes that ultimately burden business with heavy and costly requirements. The underlying regulatory objectives of the EU may be legitimate and desirable, but the side effects on the industry appear to be increasingly disproportionate (in relation to the EU food sector suffering from a lack of innovation and competitive disadvantage, see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 7 of 8 April 2011, '*Conciliation on novel foods regulation fails, impeding the adoption of new EU rules for the approval of innovative foods*').

The EU and Indonesia will reportedly launch FTA talks in November 2011

The EU and Indonesia have reportedly agreed to launch bilateral FTA talks in November 2011. This agreement follows the recent release of a study entitled *'Invigorating the Indonesia - EU Partnership: Towards a Comprehensive Economic Partnership Agreement'* (hereinafter, the EU - Indonesia Report, or the Report) by a joint EU - Indonesian '*Vision Group*' of eminent persons. The publication of the Report by the '*Vision Group*', and the reported agreement to launch FTA talks, falls within the larger framework of the EU's drive to conclude FTAs with ASEAN Countries such as Singapore and Malaysia (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 6 of 25 March 2011). These FTAs have been described by the EU's Trade Commissioner, Karl De Gucht, as '*building blocks*' towards constructing the '*bridge*' of a regional EU - ASEAN FTA, which would link the EU to a geopolitical and economic organisation with a population of approximately 600 million and a combined GDP of almost 2 trillion USD.

The Report recommends that the FTA talks be structured with the aim of seeking a '*deep FTA*', meaning an accord that would comprise liberalisation of trade in goods, services, and the flow of foreign direct investment, and be complemented by certain '*behind-the-border*' commitments to increase the degree to which sanitary and phytosanitary regulations and technical regulations are based on internationally-accepted requirements. The Report recommends that the EU and Indonesia remove tariffs on 95% of tariff lines, covering at least 95% of trade value within a maximum period of 9 years. A '*best-endeavour*' clause would allow for further negotiations on the remaining 5% of tariff lines. The Report also recommends a range of capacity building programmes, such as providing administrative support to Indonesian small/medium enterprises to boost their exports to the EU, and creating new links between European and Indonesian business associations in order to increase awareness of each jurisdiction's consumer needs. The Report provides few statistics on the possible economic benefits of an EU - Indonesia FTA, but forecasts that

such an agreement would increase Indonesia's long-term GDP by 1.3%, meaning approximately 6.3 billion EUR in 2010 GDP terms, and reduce poverty through an overall 1.5% average rise in incomes.

A key negotiating demand by the EU is that Indonesia agree to EU intellectual property legal standards, and strictly enforce intellectual property laws pertaining to European exports. As a country comprising 17,508 islands, and 33 separate provinces, Indonesia currently has a patchwork of different intellectual property laws, and this lack of uniformity is of concern to the EU business community. The EU has reportedly insisted that Indonesia agree to certain as-yet undefined '*conditions*' relating to intellectual property laws before the FTA talks are formally launched. The EU is also seeking access to Indonesia's public procurement market, most notably in public infrastructure. For its part, the EU has responded to a key Indonesian concern by agreeing in May 2011 to introduce strict import controls designed to stop the importation of illegally-logged Indonesian timber. Indonesia has reportedly also asked the EU to address its concerns that the EU may close its markets, due to environmental concerns, to Indonesian palm oil traditionally used for making biodiesel (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 10 of 21 May 2010). This relates to the EU Renewable Energy Directive (*i.e.*, *Directive 2009/28/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable resources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC*). Indonesia is concerned that the sustainability criteria in the EU Renewable Energy Directive could lead to an effective ban on biofuel produced from palm oil, and by extension ban imports of Indonesian palm oil into the EU market.

With a population of 240 million, Indonesia is Southeast Asia's most populous state. Indonesia is also Southeast Asia's largest economy, and it has been estimated that its average annual medium-term GDP growth rate will reach an impressive 7%. Over 700 EU companies are already operating in Indonesia, making the EU Indonesia's second-largest source of foreign direct investment. Yet there is much room for growth in the EU - Indonesian trade relationship: although the EU is already Indonesia's second-largest export destination (13% share of Indonesian exports), Indonesia is only the 35th largest export destination for the EU (0.5% share of EU exports), and this share has been falling in relative terms as Indonesia increasingly imports from China, India and Japan. A FTA with Indonesia could open significant new opportunities for EU exporters in the areas of machinery and electrical equipment, prepared foodstuffs, and tobacco, and create new investment opportunities in the Indonesian pharmaceutical and mining sectors.

Should the FTA negotiations be launched in November 2011, they may take several years to conclude, although the Report has urged that political engagement occur from both sides in order to finish the negotiations within two years. The EU Commission's Directorate General for Trade will be responsible for the negotiations for the EU, although the EU Commission must first receive approval of its negotiating mandate from the EU Council. The EU Parliament will have to grant its consent, through a plenary vote, of any final agreement. There will thus be involvement from all three governing EU Institutions in the EU - Indonesia FTA talks. Business parties in both the EU and Indonesia should plan ahead, engage with other stakeholders in the EU - Indonesia FTA negotiations, arrange to make their interests known to decision-makers in the EU Institutions, and investigate how increased market access in both the EU and Indonesia could be of commercial benefit.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Council Regulation (EU) No. 630/2011 of 21 June 2011 amending Regulation (EU) No. 7/2010 opening and providing for the management of autonomous tariff quotas of the Union for certain agricultural and industrial products*

- *Regulation (EU) No. 581/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 8 June 2011 amending Council Regulation (EC) No. 55/2008 introducing autonomous trade preferences for the Republic of Moldova*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 632/2011 of 29 June 2011 derogating, for 2011, from Regulation (EC) No. 1067/2008 opening and providing for the administration of Community tariff quotas for common wheat of a quality other than high quality from third countries*

Trade Remedies

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 627/2011 of 27 June 2011 imposing a provisional anti-dumping duty on imports of certain seamless pipes and tubes of stainless steel originating in the People's Republic of China*

- *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 616/2011 of 21 June 2011 terminating the expiry review and 'the new exporter' review of the anti-dumping measures concerning imports of certain magnesia bricks originating in the People's Republic of China*

- *Notice of the impending expiry of certain anti-dumping measures (Chinese frozen strawberries)*

- *Notice of initiation of an expiry review of the anti-dumping measures applicable to imports of certain seamless pipes and tubes of iron or steel originating in Croatia, Russia and Ukraine*

- *Notice of the impending expiry of certain anti-dumping measures (Chinese and Ukrainian ironing boards)*

- *Notice of initiation of an anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of certain seamless pipes and tubes of iron or steel, excluding seamless pipes and tubes of stainless steel, originating in Belarus*

Customs Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 620/2011 of 24 June 2011 amending Annex I to Council Regulation (EEC) No. 2658/87 on the tariff and statistical nomenclature and on the Common Customs Tariff*

- *Council Regulation (EU) No. 631/2011 of 21 June 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No. 1255/96 temporarily suspending the autonomous Common Customs Tariff duties on certain industrial, agricultural and fishery products*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 604/2011 of 20 June 2011 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 603/2011 of 20 June 2011 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 602/2011 of 20 June 2011 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 633/2011 of 29 June 2011 temporarily suspending customs duties on imports of certain cereals for the 2011/12 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 638/2011 of 29 June 2011 establishing the standard import values for determining the entry price of certain fruit and vegetables*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 639/2011 of 29 June 2011 amending the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector fixed by Regulation (EU) No. 867/2010 for the 2010/11 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 629/2011 of 28 June 2011 amending the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector fixed by Regulation (EU) No. 867/2010 for the 2010/11 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 625/2011 of 27 June 2011 amending the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector fixed by Regulation (EU) No. 867/2010 for the 2010/11 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 618/2011 of 24 June 2011 withdrawing the suspension of submission of applications for import licences for sugar products under tariff quota 09.4380*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 613/2011 of 23 June 2011 fixing representative prices in the poultrymeat and egg sectors and for egg albumin, and amending Regulation (EC) No. 1484/95*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 609/2011 of 22 June 2011 withdrawing the suspension of submission of applications for import licences for sugar products under certain tariff quotas*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 601/2011 of 21 June 2011 amending the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector fixed by Regulation (EU) No. 867/2010 for the 2010/11 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 589/2011 of 20 June 2011 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 302/2011 opening an exceptional import tariff quota for certain quantities of sugar in the 2010/11 marketing year*

- *Commission Decision of 17 June 2011 amending Decision 2006/197/EC as regards the renewal of the authorisation to place on the market existing feed produced from genetically modified maize line 1507 (DAS-Ø15Ø7-1) pursuant to Regulation (EC) No. 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council (notified under document C(2011) 4159)*

- *Commission Decision of 17 June 2011 authorising the placing on the market of products containing, consisting of, or produced from genetically modified maize MON 89034 × MON 88017 (MON-89Ø34-3xMON-88Ø17-3) pursuant to Regulation (EC) No. 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council (notified under document C(2011) 4164)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 587/2011 of 17 June 2011 amending the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector fixed by Regulation (EU) No. 867/2010 for the 2010/11 marketing year*

- *Commission Decision of 17 June 2011 authorising the placing on the market of products containing, consisting of, or produced from genetically modified cotton GHB614 (BCS-GHØØ2-5) pursuant to Regulation (EC) No. 1829/2003 of the European Parliament and of the Council (notified under document C(2011) 4177) (1)*

Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 596/2011 of 7 June 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Fichi di Cosenza (PDO)]*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 584/2011 of 17 June 2011 approving non-minor amendments to the specification for a name entered in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications (Grana Padano (PDO))*

Eugenia Laurenza, Ignacio Carreño, Nicholas Richards-Bentley and Paolo R. Vergano contributed to this issue.