FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 11 of 1 June 2012

The US imposes preliminary anti-dumping duties on imports of solar panels from China

On 17 May 2012, the US Department of Commerce (hereinafter, DoC) imposed preliminary anti-dumping duties on imports of crystalline silicon photovoltaic cells (hereinafter, solar panels), whether or not assembled into modules from China. The DoC preliminarily determined that Chinese producers and exporters sold solar panels in the US at dumping margins ranging from 31.14% to 249.96%, with the vast majority of businesses being assigned duties of around 31%. This preliminary determination follows the approximately 3-5% tariffs announced by the DoC on 20 March 2012 in the parallel countervailing duty investigation.

The Coalition for American Solar Manufacturing (hereinafter, CASM), led by SolarWorld Industries America, petitioned the US to investigate Chinese solar panel imports. For the purpose of US anti-dumping investigations, dumping occurs when a foreign company sells a product in the US at less than fair value. To file an anti-dumping petition with the DoC and the US International Trade Commission (hereinafter, ITC), the interested party, here CASM, must allege that: (1) the solar panel manufacturing industry in the US is materially injured or threatened with material injury or that the establishment of an industry is materially retarded; (2) by reason of imports that are being, or are likely to be, sold in the US at less than fair value or by reason of imports that are being subsidised by the governments of one or more countries. A few important issues led to the preliminary determination of injurious dumping in the US resulting from imports of Chinese manufactured solar panels. First, the significant price drop of solar panels in 2009-2010 left producers with an overabundance of inventory requiring them to sell at reduced prices. Second, as a non-market economy, US law required the DoC to measure potential Chinese dumping based on third-country production costs, rather than on actual prices and production costs of Chinese manufacturers. Here, the DoC used production costs in Thailand to determine the level of dumping, which may have increased preliminary dumping margins.

The DoC is scheduled to issue final determinations as to the anti-dumping duties in early October 2012. If the DoC and the ITC make affirmative final determinations that imports of solar panels from China did materially injure, or threaten material injury to, the US solar panel industry, a final order will be issued and the duties will be imposed on Chinese solar panel imports. This would cause a significant dent in American purchases of Chinese solar panels as US consumers imported approximately USD 3.1 billion worth of Chinese solar panels in 2011, meaning that US consumers purchasing Chinese solar panels would see average prices increasing by more than 31% at least. This price increase could potentially cause damage to the expanding US '*green energy*' sector. Further, this determination could lead to '*trade diversion*', where many Chinese manufacturers shift production to factories located outside China, if necessary, to avert paying many of these duties.

Similarly, German solar panel manufacturer SolarWorld AG, parent company of SolarWorld Industries America that led the US petition, is currently forming a European organisation modelled on CASM to demand equally strong EU action against China. If firms representing more than 25% of Europe's solar panel manufacturing output sign an anti-dumping or anti-subsidy petition, the EU would be obliged to launch investigations within 45 days, provided that the petition provides sufficient evidence to justify the initiation of proceedings. A publication of definitive results on whether material injury has been suffered by the EU solar panel industry directly resulting from alleged dumping by Chinese producers (or subsidisation) and, if so, whether it is in the economic interests of the EU to impose measures, must be issued within 15 months of the initiation of the anti-dumping investigation (13 months for anti-subsidy investigations). This determination would have significant ramifications on both the EU solar panel manufacturing industry, as well as European businesses operating in the '*green energy*' sector. The evolution of any potential petition submitted to the EU Commission, and its subsequent investigation, should be carefully monitored by all European businesses operating within the solar industry, especially raw material suppliers, installation and maintenance companies, equipment manufacturers, and construction companies.

France reported to be trying to revive EU initiative on carbon tax

The French Government announced last week its intention to re-launch the proposal on the establishment of an EU tariff on imported goods originating from third countries with lax environmental regulations. Far from being a new initiative, the idea dates back to 2008, when the EU Commission discussed the possibility of companies having to buy EU pollution permits in order to export their products to Europe. In spite of the lack of success of the initiative in 2008, France has now rescued it and rebranded it as the '*carbon inclusion mechanism*' (hereinafter, CIM). Under the scheme, European importers would be compelled to buy pollution permits from the EU's carbon '*Emissions Trading System'* (hereinafter, ETS). Based on Directive 2003/87/EC (*of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 2003 establishing a scheme for greenhouse gas emission allowance trading within the Community and amending Council Directive 96/61/EC*), the ETS constitutes a market-based mechanism to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through a '*cap-and-trade*' system, which establishes ceilings for the overall level of carbon emissions allowed by certain industries in the EU. Companies emitting greenhouse gases in the EU are allocated a number of carbon allowances. At the end of each year, they must be able to surrender enough of them so as to cover all their emissions, and hence avoid fines. Simultaneously, operators having reduced their emissions may trade off their spare emission permits (see Trade Perspectives Issue No. 12 of 18 June 2010). Under the proposed CIM scheme, the EU would offer partnership agreements to emerging economies where key industrial sectors (such as steelmaking, aluminium and cement) are particularly sensitive to EU competition, especially in light of the higher EU environmental standards. Traders in these areas would be granted access to low-carbon technologies and an exception to the ETS, while traders not covered by the agreement would be compelled to clear the equivalent EU pollution permits.

The EU is building a track record of environmental policies that are increasingly raising suspicions or opposition within its trading partners. For instance, in April 2009, the EU Council adopted the 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 sources and amending and subsequently repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC*), establishing a common framework for the promotion of energy originating from renewable sources in the EU by, *inter alia*, setting mandatory national overall targets and measures for the use of energy from renewable sources. Concerns were raised in respect to the sustainability criteria for biofuel and biodiesel,

particularly their impact on trade and their potentially discriminatory effects (see Trade Perspectives Issue No. 10 of 21 May 2010).

In addition, the so-called Fuel Quality Directive (*Directive 2009/30/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 amending Directive 98/70/EC as regards the specification of petrol, diesel and gas-oil and introducing a mechanism to monitor and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and amending Council Directive 1999/32/EC as regards the specification of fuel used by inland waterway vessels and repealing Directive 93/12/EEC*) was adopted, requiring EU Member States to reduce the levels of greenhouse gas emissions of transportation fuels by 6% by 2020. Under the Fuel Quality Directive, the methodology to calculate compliance with the reduction target requires a calculation of the lifecycle greenhouse gas intensity of fossil fuels that should be conducted through the determination of default values for each type of fossil fuel. A particularly controversial aspect of this legislation that is being debated by the EU Commission and EU Member States in the context of developing implementing measures, relates to the determination of default values for fossil fuels and whether certain fuels (*i.e.*, fuel produced from tar sands and shale oil) should be attributed higher '*polluting*' values than other fuels (see Trade Perspectives Issue No. 5 of 9 March 2012).

In March 2011, the EU Commission announced that carbon emissions from aviation would also be subject to the EU's ETS, meaning that airlines operating to and from EU airports would be subject to a cap on carbon emissions as of the beginning of 2012. The extension of the EU's ETS to aviation has led to wide opposition from a coalition of 26 nations led by China, India, Russia and the US, some of which have even threatened to retaliate against European airlines and/or the EU, in various forms. Discussions are currently being held regarding the possibility of the ETS being extended to cover also emissions from maritime transport.

The EU has also adopted policies aiming at ensuring sustainable management of fisheries and forestry resources through instruments, such as the EU IUU Regulation (*Council Regulation (EC) No. 1005/2008 of 29 September 2008 establishing a Community system to prevent, deter and eliminate illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing*) and the Forest Law Enforcement Governance and Trade framework (composed, in relevant part, by (i) *Council Regulation (EC) No. 2173/2005 of 20 December 2005 on the establishment of a FLEGT licensing scheme for imports of timber into the European Community;* (ii) *Commission Regulation (EC) No. 1024/2008 of 17 October 2008 laying down detailed measures for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No. 2173/2005 on the establishment of a FLEGT licensing scheme for imports of timber into the European Community; and* (iii) *Regulation (EU) No. 995/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 20 October 2010 laying down the obligations of operators who place timber and timber products on the market)*, aimed at combating illegal practices and establishing licensing systems.

The suggested CIM scheme might, however, be problematic under WTO Law. In particular, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter, GATT) requires that any advantage conferred to a WTO Member must be extended, in respect of '*like products*', to all other WTO Members. Besides, WTO Members are precluded from imposing tariffs in excess of those that they have committed to in their Schedules of Concessions, and internal taxes or charges in excess of those applied to '*like*' domestic products are also prohibited. Should it finally become a reality, the specific design of the CIM will have to ensure that no country is granted, neither in law nor in fact, discriminatory treatment in respect of the tariffs imposed thereto, as well as regarding any substantial regulation, so that the aforementioned obligations are complied with. Nonetheless, it must be borne in mind that the GATT allows, in derogation of the prohibitions above, measures that are otherwise WTO-inconsistent, so long as they comply with strict requirements. In this respect, Article XX of the GATT allows WTO Members to adopt measures aimed at the protection of '*human, animal or plant life or*

health' or '*relating to the conservation of exhaustible natural resources*' (Articles XX (b) and (g), respectively), to the extent that they are not discriminatory. In this regard, WTO Members adopting measures covered by Article XX of the GATT need to ensure that their policies comply not only with the specific paragraph, but also with the '*chapeau'*, concerning the manner in which the measure is applied. So far, in the majority of WTO cases, WTO Members have been unable to justify their environmental policies under the General Exceptions envisaged by GATT Article XX.

Businesses operating in the relevant industrial sectors are therefore strongly advised to follow closely the ongoing developments in these important areas of economic activity and environmental protection and to consider addressing the impact of these new policies of the EU in all appropriate *fora*, either directly or in cooperation with their governments or trade associations.

The EU adopts new rules for fruit juices, providing for numerous changes in relation to its composition and labelling

On 27 April 2012, the EU's Official Journal published *Directive 2012/12/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 April 2012 amending Council Directive 2001/112/EC relating to fruit juices and certain similar products intended for human consumption* (hereinafter, the Directive), which was adopted following a first-reading agreement between the EU Parliament and the EU Council. The Directive adapts the current rules on fruit juices to technological progress, while taking into account quality factors and labelling requirements established in the relevant international standard, the Codex Alimentarius Standard 247-2005 for fruit juices and nectars (hereinafter, the Codex Standard). When the proposal for the Directive was adopted on 21 September 2010, it was also noted that new rules were requested by the European fruit juices industry and should be in line with the EU policy of reducing added sugars in products and promoting a balanced diet (see Trade Perspectives Issue No. 18 of 08 October 2010).

Under the Directive, the addition of sugars to fruit juices is no longer authorised, while for other products, like fruit nectars, sugars can be added, provided that any addition is labelled in accordance with *Directive 2000/13/EC on the labelling of foodstuffs*. Technically, the prohibition of adding sugar to fruit juices has been achieved by the omission in part II, 1 to the Annex of the Directive (concerning authorised ingredients), of the sentence: '*[f]or products defined in part I.1, 2 and 3 (i.e. fruit juices, concentrated fruit juice and dehydrated/powdered fruit juice), other than pear or grape juice, the addition of sugars is authorised*', which was present in *Directive 2001/112/EC*. The nutrition claim *'with no added sugars'*, as listed in the Annex to *Regulation (EC) No. 1924/2006 on nutrition and health claims made on foods,* which, according to the Directive, has been used for a very long time for fruit juices, is no longer permitted in light of the new compositional requirements for fruit juices. Although, in practice, very few juices seem to contain added sugars, and those that do normally indicate so clearly on the label, the fact that the addition of sugar to juices is now prohibited by law should give consumers confidence that fruit juices do not contain added sugar. The EU argues in the Directive that the disappearance of the claim *'with no added sugars'* from one day to the next after a transitional period, might not allow an immediate clear distinction to be made between fruit juices and other drinks in terms of the addition of sugars in the products, which would be detrimental to the fruit juices sector. Therefore, in order to enable the industry to properly inform consumers, the Directive permits for a limited time (until 28 October 2016) a statement indicating that no fruit juices contain added sugars: *'from 28 October 2015 no fruit juices contain added sugars'*. This statement may appear on the label in the same field of vision as the name of products.

In addition, the Directive reaffirms the distinction between fruit juice and fruit juice from concentrate, simplifies the provisions on the restitution of flavours, and includes tomatoes in the list of fruits used for fruit juice production. Although being a '*culinary vegetable*', botanically, tomatoes are fruits. *Directive 2001/112/EEC* does not currently consider tomatoes as fruit, contrary to the Codex Standard. The Directive, thus, provides in Annex II (Definitions of raw materials) that, for the purposes of this Directive, tomatoes are also considered as fruit and Annex I provides under *'authorised ingredients'* that salt, spices and aromatic herbs may be added to tomato juice and tomato juice from concentrate.

In relation to mixed juices, the Directive provides that a mix of two juices must, in the future, have a product name that reflects the contents. For products manufactured from two or more fruits (except where lemon and/or lime juice are used under certain conditions), the product name shall be *'composed of'* a list of the fruits used, in descending order of the volume of the fruit juices or purées included, as indicated in the list of ingredients. *Directive 2001/112/EEC* states that the product names shall be *'supplemented by'* a list of the fruits used. This minor textual difference permits, for example, that currently a mixture of a large amount of apple juice and a minor amount of strawberry juice may be named after the minority ingredient *'Strawberry juice'* (supplemented by a list of the fruits used), while, under the Directive, it must be called *'Apple and strawberry juice'*. For products manufactured from three or more fruits, the indication of the fruits used may be replaced by the words *'several fruits'* or a similar wording, or by the number of fruits used. Therefore, generic names like *'Mixed juice'* can be used if there are three or more fruit sources. The element of 'mixed juices' in the Directive is of particular relevance to international trade. The Codex Standard states in part 3 (Essential composition and quality factors) under point 3.1.2. (other permitted ingredients), letter (e) that *'subject to national legislation of the importing country, the juice from Citrus reticulata and/or hybrids with reticulata may be added to orange juice in an amount not to exceed 10% of soluble solids of the reticulata to the total of soluble solids of orange juice'.* This appears to have led to the possible situation that, products sold as *'orange juice',* but containing up to 10% mandarin juice (which contributes to colour and taste), were in line with the Codex Standard. Although this practice was not expressly permitted in the EU under *Directive 2001/112/EEC*, the Directive now clarifies that all imported and EU orange juices must be pure in order to be sold as such, or need to include mandarin in the product name, if present. The Codex Standard states that the permissible 90% orange juice / 10% mandarin juice ratio is *'subject to national legislation of the importing country'.* Therefore, the EU has clarified that its legislation does not allow such a ratio in *'pure'* orange juice.

The Directive provides for numerous changes in relation to the composition and labelling of fruit juices and certain similar products. The Directive entered into force on 27 April 2012 and EU Member States need to transpose the Directive into their national legislation before 28 October 2013. In practice, the European fruit juices industry seems to have implemented most changes in the law beforehand. However, for those operators that are not yet in compliance, the Directive permits that *'products which are placed on the market or labelled before 28 October 2013 in accordance with Directive 2001/112/EC may continue to be marketed until 28 April 2015'.* And for those manufacturers that still want to make a *'no added sugar*' claim on certain fruit drinks, the Directive provides that *'[a] claim stating that sugars have not been added to fruit nectar, and any claim likely to have the same meaning for the consumer, may only be made where the product does not contain any added mono- or disaccharides or any other food used for its sweetening properties, including sweeteners as defined in Regulation (EC) No. 1333/2008, while the following indication should also appear on the label: 'contains naturally occurring sugars,' if sugars are naturally present in fruit nectar.*

The EU and the US agree to mutually recognise each other's certified trusted traders

With global trade expanding over the past years, the chain of transport and logistics systems for the world's cargo is becoming increasingly complex, which has required EU and US customs administrations to improve the tools for managing the movement of goods and reacting to threats related to security, safety and fraud. In response to these challenges, the EU and the US Customs and Border Protection (hereinafter, CBP) signed a mutual recognition decision on 4 May 2012, which recognises compatibility between the EU's Authorised Economic Operator programme (hereinafter, AEO) and the CBP's Customs-Trade Partnership Against Terrorism (hereinafter, C-TPAT) cargo security programme.

From 1 July 2012, the EU and the US will formally recognise each other's '*trusted traders*', which stands to generate immediate benefits for customs authorities and international business. This agreement was facilitated, in part, by the support received through the Transatlantic Economic Council (hereinafter, TEC), which is the central platform for EU-US cooperation on a wide range of high-profile regulatory and strategic issues, with a view to furthering trade, investment and creating jobs for Europeans and Americans. This agreement comes at the time of other noteworthy mutual recognition agreements between the EU and US, such as the bilateral agreement signed on 15 February 2012 recognising each other's respective standards and control systems for organic food as equivalent (for additional information on the EU-US organic farming equivalency agreement see Trade Perspectives Issue No. 4 of 24 February 2012). These agreements, along with continued TEC collaboration, present encouraging signs of continuing cooperation and greater trade facilitation between the two major trading partners.

Mutual customs recognition intends to promote the harmonisation of customs practices and procedures for both the EU and US, which should contribute to the smoother flow of goods and further boost trade opportunities between the two trading partners accounting for almost EUR 500 billion in trade during 2011. Additionally, mutual recognition will improve security by helping to ensure that security checks on traded goods focus on high risk cargo areas and, therefore, are more effective in protecting citizens from potential terrorist attacks, while freely allowing the flow of goods placed in transit from trusted traders. Certified AEO and C-TPAT companies stand to benefit significantly from this mutual recognition on customs matters. For example, EU and US certified trusted traders will benefit from faster controls, receive simplified procedures, have reduced administrative burdens for customs clearance and realise greater predictability in transatlantic actions. Recognised trusted traders will further benefit from more effective container inspection, which should result in shipments reaching their markets more efficiently. Trusted traders should also enjoy cost savings on their exports, which is particularly important for small and medium enterprises (SMEs) where any price reduction and decrease in shipping time is of added significance.

Launched in 2008, the EU's AEO programme currently comprises 500 approved companies profiting from trusted trader status. Achieving AEO status classifies a company as being a safe and reliable business engaged in international trade. AEOs are considered highly trusted trade partners by customs authorities because they are proven to deliver high standards of security and compliance. Consequently, fewer inspections are necessary on trusted traders' goods and formal customs procedures are quicker to fill in, resulting in goods moving faster from one destination to another, thereby helping to reduce transport costs. AEO status can be granted to any economic operator established in the EU, which meets the following criteria: (1) an appropriate record of compliance with customs requirements; (2) appropriate record keeping with a satisfactory system of managing commercial and transport records, where applicable; (3) proven financial solvency; and (4) where applicable, appropriate security and safety standards.

Some 10,500 companies (*i.e.*, 500 AEO and 10,000 C-TPAT) will immediately benefit from the EU-US mutual recognition agreement on 1 July 2012. In addition, AEOs enjoy benefits from mutual recognition agreements already in place with Switzerland, Norway and Japan, while negotiations are being explored for a similar agreement with the EU's second largest trade partner, China. Therefore, AEOs will continue to reap supplementary gains resulting from simplified customs procedures, lower costs and faster access to markets across the globe, which should increase profits and reduce unnecessary administrative burdens. These mutual recognition agreements are an encouraging sign for EU businesses that should be expanded upon in the future to include other important trading areas and partners, with the aim of stimulating trade and economic activity, particularly at this time of crisis. Businesses wishing to benefit from the EU-US mutual recognition agreement, as well as all current and future recognition agreements, should consider applying for AEO status to an AEO competent customs authority.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Trade Remedies

- *Commission Decision of 21 May 2012 terminating the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of certain woven and/or stitched glass fibre fabrics originating in the People's Republic of China*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 437/2012 of 23 May 2012 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 Taiwan and Thailand, whether declared as originating in Taiwan and Thailand or not, and making such imports subject to registration*

- *Commission Decision of 23 May 2012 terminating the anti-subsidy proceeding concerning imports of certain stainless steel fasteners and parts thereof originating in India*

Customs Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 455/2012 of 22 May 2012 concerning the classification of certain goods in the Combined Nomenclature*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 440/2012 of 24 May 2012 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 439/2011 on a derogation from Regulation (EEC) No. 2454/93 in respect of the definition of the concept of originating products used for the purposes of the scheme of generalised tariff preferences to take account of the special situation of Cape Verde regarding exports of certain fisheries products to the European Union*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 451/2012 of 29 May 2012 on the withdrawal from the market of certain feed additives belonging to the functional group of silage additives*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 456/2012 of 30 May 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No. 1266/2007 on implementing rules for Council Directive 2000/75/EC as regards the control, monitoring, surveillance and restrictions on movements of certain animals of susceptible species in relation to bluetongue*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 427/2012 of 22 May 2012 on the extension of special guarantees concerning salmonella laid down in Regulation (EC) No. 853/2004 of the European Parliament and of the Council to eggs intended for Denmark*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 2 May 2012 on the inclusion of vine varieties in Appendix IV of the Protocol on wine labelling as referred to in Article 8(2) of the EC-US Agreement on trade in wine.*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 432/2012 of 16 May 2012 establishing a list of permitted health claims made on foods, other than those referring to the reduction of disease risk and to children's development and health*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 450/2012 of 29 May 2012 amending Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 543/2011 as regards the trigger levels for additional duties on tomatoes, apricots, lemons, plums, peaches, including nectarines, pears and table grapes*

Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 426/2012 of 22 May 2012 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications (Πράσινες Ελιές Χαλκιδικής (Prasines Elies Chalkidikis) (PDO))*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 428/2012 of 22 May 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No. 607/2009 laying down certain detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No. 479/2008 as regards protected designations of origin and geographical indications, traditional terms, labelling and presentation of certain wine sector products*

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

Other

- *Council Decision of 14 May 2012 on the signing, on behalf of the Union, of the Framework Agreement on Comprehensive Partnership and Cooperation between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, of the other part*

- *Notice concerning the entry into force of an Agreement on Trade in Bananas between the European Union and Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Peru and Venezuela*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 454/2012 of 15 May 2012 establishing a prohibition of fishing for hake in VI and VII; EU and international waters of Vb; international waters of XII and XIV by vessels flying the flag of the Netherlands*

- *Council Decision of 14 May 2012 on the signing, on behalf of the Union, of the Framework Agreement on Partnership and Cooperation between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and the Republic of the Philippines, of the other part*

- *Council Decision of 14 May 2012 on the signing, on behalf of the Union, of the Framework Agreement on Partnership and Cooperation between the European Union and its Member States, of the one part, and Mongolia, of the other part*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 433/2012 of 23 May 2012 laying down detailed rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No. 1236/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down a scheme of control and enforcement applicable in the area covered by the Convention on future multilateral cooperation in the North-East Atlantic fisheries*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 460/2012 of 29 May 2012 establishing a prohibition of fishing in category 9 'pelagic freezer trawlers' in the Mauritanian Economic Zone by vessels flying the flag of a Member State of the European Union.*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 459/2012 of 29 May 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No. 715/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council and Commission Regulation (EC) No. 692/2008 as regards emissions from light passenger and commercial vehicles (Euro 6)*

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