FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 20 of 4 November 2011

The EU considers reforming '*dual-use*' export authorisation regulations

The EU Commission recently initiated a discussion regarding possible reforms to the regulation of '*dual-use*' exports (*i.e.*, items which can be used for both civil and military purposes). These items are currently subject to export authorisation requirements before they may be exported to third countries. On 30 June 2011, the EU Commission adopted a green paper on the EU's '*dual-use*' export control system. The green paper is designed to begin the review process of the EU '*dual-use*' export control system required by Article 25 of *Regulation (EC) No. 428/2009 of 5 May 2009 setting up a Community regime for the control of exports, transfer, brokering and transit of dual-use items* (hereinafter, the Dual-use Regulation). The publication of the green paper was followed by a public consultation that ended on 31 October 2011, and which will inform the EU Commission's report on the results of the green paper process in January 2012.

Due to two key rulings issued by the European Court of Justice in 1995, '*dual-use*' export controls are considered an exclusive competence of the EU, excluding the competence of EU Member States with the exception of where the EU has granted them specific authorisation to apply exceptional national measures under *Regulation (EEC) No. 2603/69 of the Council of 20 December 1969 establishing common rules for exports*, and under the Dual-use Regulation. The list of controlled '*dual-use*' items is set out in Annex I of the Dual-use Regulation. There are currently four types of export authorisations under EU law, the last three of which are issued by EU Member States. The first type of '*dual-use*' export authorisations, issued solely by the EU, are known as '*Community General Export Authorisations*'. These cover exports of most controlled '*dual-use*' items to developed countries such as Australia, Canada, Japan, and the US. The second type of '*dual-use*' export authorisations are known as '*National General Export Authorisations*'. EU Member States may issue these provided that they do not conflict with existing '*Community General Export Authorisations*', and do not cover any of the items listed in Part 2 of Annex II of the Dual-use Regulation. France, Germany and the UK are among the EU Member States which currently have '*National General Export Authorisations*'. The third type of '*dual-use*' export authorisations are known as '*Global Authorisations*'. These may be granted by individual EU Member States to one particular exporter, and cover one or more '*dual-use*' items destined to be exported to one or more countries or end users. The fourth type of '*dual-use*' export authorisations are known as '*Individual Licenses*', and are granted by individual EU Member States to one particular exporter, and are valid for exports of '*dual-use*' items to only one end user.

In addition, the Dual-use Regulation permits national authorities of EU Member States to impose certain additional *ad hoc* export authorisation requirements. For instance, Article 4 of the Dual-use Regulation permits national authorities to impose export controls on '*dual-use*' items which are not listed in Annex I of the Dual-use Regulation. This authorisation requirement is only valid in the issuing EU Member State and affects only a particular transaction or type of transaction. Article 8 of the Dual-use Regulation allows national

authorities to control additional lists of '*dual-use*' items due to public security or human rights considerations. Although the Dual-use Regulation provides a general regulatory framework for '*dual-use*' export authorisations, the practical implementation of these regulations is left to EU Member States. The result is that EU Member States apply '*patchwork*' regulatory approaches to '*dual-use*' export controls across the EU rather than, for example, implementing a harmonised EU-wide approach whereby security exceptions may be invoked by EU Member States on a case-by-case basis in the context of high-risk export transactions. These regulatory variations create commercial burdens: EU Member States have different rules regarding registration and reporting requirements for exporters of '*dual-use*' items. An additional obstacle is created by situations in which the export of a '*dual-use*' item from one EU Member State is prohibited or delayed, while the export of the same item from another EU Member State is completed without hindrance.

The EU Commission's green paper calls for a more integrated approach to the authorisation of '*dual-use*' export items across the EU. '*Dual-use*' export authorisation decisions would be given on the basis of fully harmonised rules across the EU, but according to which EU Member States would still retain the right to block certain exports if the items could be diverted for illicit military programmes. This proposal includes four major components: a common risk assessment approach; a decentralised enforcement model based on interlinked national export control authorities; enhanced exchanges of information concerning all elements of export control assessments; and a consistent set of EU-wide export control tools, including phasing out '*National General Export Authorisations*' in favour of greater use of '*Community General Export Authorisations*'. The proposals outlined in the green paper appear to offer several commercial advantages to EU exporters. First, a more predictable EU-wide export authorisation regulatory environment could allow for more effective business planning and improve the global competitiveness of EU exporters. Secondly, stronger information-sharing could allow enforcement resources to be focused on the small fraction of high-risk transactions amongst '*dual-use*' exports. Better information sharing could, for instance, lead to a wider use of '*National General Export Authorisations*' to facilitate '*dual-use*' exports in low-risk situations (*e.g.*, only 7 EU Members have currently made '*National General Export Authorisations*' available to their exporters).

The '*dual-use*' export authorisation proposals in the EU Commission's green paper have significant commercial implications for EU exporters. An estimated 5,000 EU companies are involved in the export of '*dual-use*' items, accounting for as much as 10% of the EU's total export volume, and covering many high value-added industries such as the nuclear, chemicals, aerospace and telecommunications sectors. However, the EU Commission's green paper notes that changing market patterns, in particular the increased foreign availability of certain '*dual-use*' items, and simplification of export control procedures being undertaken in certain third countries, may threaten EU exporters in this important commercial sector. These factors appear to increase the urgency of reforming the EU's '*dual-use*' export authorisation regime. Following the EU Commission's formal report on the green paper results in January 2012, a further report will be submitted by the EU Commission in September 2012 to the EU Parliament and EU Council. The EU Commission may then propose amendments to the Dual-use Regulation during 2013-2014. Commercial actors should monitor these important developments closely.

Russia moves towards WTO accession

The long-running negotiations for Russia's accession to the WTO could be concluded by the end of this year. Russia applied for membership in the WTO's forerunner, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, in 1993. On 21 October 2011, it was reported that Russia and the EU settled all outstanding bilateral questions, leaving only a disagreement between Russia and Georgia on trans-border cargo monitoring in South Ossetia and Abkhazia to be

resolved. In the middle of the previous week, Georgia made a final proposal to Russia, which the Deputy Foreign Minister of Georgia characterised as '*an agreement that has everything they've asked'*. If Russia agrees to the terms proposed by Georgia, the decision on Russia's accession could be taken by consensus in the course of the upcoming Ministerial Conference in Geneva on 15-17 December 2011. However, according to the Russian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Russia might seek WTO Membership even without reaching agreement with Georgia.

Article XII.2 of the Marrakesh Agreement Establishing the WTO states that decisions on accession shall be taken by a two-thirds majority of the Members of the WTO. Nevertheless, there is a strong institutional tendency to take such decisions by consensus. Still, the history of the WTO has seen accession through majority voting. The General Council decision on the accession of Ecuador in 1995 was adopted by a two-thirds majority. However, thereafter the General Council agreed on a statement by the Chair that accessions shall be decided by consensus. The statement made it clear that, where consensus is not achieved, the matter shall be decided by voting and the agreed procedure does not preclude a Member from requesting a vote. Interested WTO Members will try to facilitate a final agreement between Russia and Georgia during the next few weeks. However, if no agreement is reached, voting appears to be a viable way to move Russia's WTO accession towards a conclusion.

The terms of Russia's accession have not yet been made public. However, it is already clear that Russia undertook substantial obligations to secure the WTO compatibility of both its domestic rules and the rules of the recent Customs Union of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia (hereinafter, the CU). On 19 May 2011, the Interstate Council of EurAsEC (the Supreme Body of the CU) delivered the text of the Agreement on the functioning of the CU within the multilateral trading system, which is undoubtedly a big step towards the harmonisation of the CU's regulations with the standards of the WTO. According to Article 1 of this Agreement, upon the accession of any of the CU Members to the WTO, the rules of the WTO (as determined in the Accession Protocol) become an integral part of the legal system of the CU. The common external customs tariff shall be adjusted to the levels specified in the Accession Protocol of the WTO Member that has acceded. Article 2 of the Agreement provides that, in case of any conflict between WTO provisions and the regulations of the CU, the former shall prevail. As explained by the Economic Adviser of the President of Russia, this agreement was requested by WTO Members as a condition of Russia's accession to the WTO. The Agreement is subject to ratification by all three parties to the CU. Russia ratified it on 20 October 2011. The ratification procedures in Belarus and Kazakhstan are still ongoing.

The adoption of such an agreement will have huge implications for businesses exporting to Russia, Kazakhstan and Belarus. According to Article 4.3 of the Constitution of Kazakhstan and Article 15.4 of the Constitution of Russia, ratified international treaties have priority over domestic laws and are applied directly. Articles 8.3 and 116.4 of the Constitution of Belarus are also often interpreted to give direct effect to ratified international treaties. Finally, the courts in all three States tend to effectively give precedence to international law in case of conflicts with domestic legislation. As a result, in case of a successful ratification of the Agreement of 19 May 2011, WTO rules will be introduced into the national legal systems of Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan via the CU's legal system and will obtain precedence over domestic laws. Moreover, WTO agreements will be directly enforceable before the domestic courts of Belarus, Kazakhstan and Russia. The direct effect of WTO agreements in the three States should significantly contribute to stability, transparency and the rule of law in the region.

Russia remains the largest world economy outside the WTO. The particular business implications of its WTO accession will greatly depend on the terms of Russia's accession. However, some of the major concerns of foreign companies appear to have already been

addressed in the course of bilateral negotiations. The reduction of comparatively high import duties will in any case enhance the opportunities for foreign products to enter the Russian market. The value of annual imports into Russia is currently estimated at 237.3 billion USD. As part of the WTO deal, Russia has agreed to gradually remove its system of dual pricing in energy resources, which should undoubtedly make foreign goods more competitive in the Russian market. An agreement was also reached between Russia and the EU on the Russian investment regime for car production, which was not particularly appreciated by EU manufacturers of automobile parts. Russia and the EU have agreed on a compensation mechanism to be triggered if exports of EU car parts to Russia fall as a result of the new investment regime. Finally, the EU has also secured a guarantee from Russia that an agreement to change the scheme of Siberian overflight payments, costly for EU airlines, will be reached in the coming months.

The EU still has not set maximum permitted levels of vitamins and minerals in food supplements

The EU has failed so far to adopt harmonised rules on the maximum permitted levels of vitamins and minerals in food supplements. In the meantime, according to a legal analysis commissioned by the Council for Responsible Nutrition, a trade association representing dietary supplement manufacturers and ingredient suppliers in the US and the EU (hereinafter, CRN), countries that set maximum levels of vitamins and minerals in supplements based on recommended dietary allowances (hereinafter, RDAs) do not comply with the latest science and presumably violate WTO rules.

The setting of maximum levels of vitamins and minerals in food supplements is a contentious issue. There are two main positions: setting maximum levels based on RDAs (*i.e.*, recommended intakes of nutrients) or setting them as upper safe limits, based on a risk assessment. It is obvious that the recommended level may be substantially lower than an upper safe level.

According to the study commissioned by CRN, a number of countries, including Chile and Venezuela, restrict the sale of food supplements containing vitamins and minerals by establishing maximum levels tied exclusively to the RDAs (to protect human health), while others (such as Saudi Arabia) regulate food supplements with levels above the RDAs as pharmaceutical drugs. The study concludes that restricting the nutrient content of food supplements to RDA-based maximum levels without any risk assessment appears to violate several provisions of the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade, the WTO Agreement on the Application of Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. In addition, the study finds that food regulations setting RDA-based maximums in food supplements are inconsistent with the international guidelines adopted by the Codex Alimentarius (*i.e.*, the Vitamin and Mineral Food Supplement Guideline CAC/GL 55 – 2005) which specifies that maximum levels of nutrients in food supplements should be based primarily on risk assessments, and not solely on RDAs.

The legal assessment commissioned by CRN did not deal with the situation in the EU. Article 5 of Directive 2002/46/EC on food supplements states that maximum amounts of vitamins and minerals present in food supplements per daily portion of consumption, as recommended by the manufacturer, shall be set, taking the following into account: (a) upper safe levels of vitamins and minerals established by scientific risk assessment based on generally accepted scientific data, taking into account, as appropriate, the varying degrees of sensitivity of different consumer groups; and (b) intake of vitamins and minerals from other dietary sources. When the maximum levels are set, due account should also be taken of reference intakes of vitamins and minerals for the population. However, almost 10 years

after the adoption of Directive 2002/46/EC, the implementing rules have not yet been adopted and the rules in the EU Member States dealing with maximum amounts of nutrients in food supplements are far from being harmonised. In 2006, the EU Commission launched a consultation on the setting of maximum and minimum amounts for vitamins and minerals in foodstuffs and received numerous comments from stakeholders, including EU Member States. Germany, similarly to France, argues that when setting maximum amounts of vitamins and minerals, the recommended intakes based on the concept of the Population Reference Intakes (PRIs) and RDAs should be taken into account, as this would allow risks of deficiency in the population or specific population groups to be factored in. A careful risk assessment is necessary in each individual case, particularly for nutrients (*e.g.*, vitamin A) for which there appears to be only a narrow margin between the recommended intake and higher levels where health risks cannot be excluded or are liable to occur). The UK Government believes that maximum levels should be based on risk and does not agree that PRIs can be used as the basis for establishing maximum levels for vitamin and minerals in supplements, but it agrees that they should be taken into account when setting minimum levels. The European Food Safety Authority completed on 28 July 2009 the first assessment of vitamin and mineral sources used in food supplements. It was initially hoped that a draft proposal would be published in January 2009, but there have been further delays.

In this context (see Trade Perspectives Issue No. 11 of 4 June 2010), on 29 April 2010, the Court of Justice of the European Union (hereinafter, ECJ) delivered a judgement in Case C-446/08 (Solgar Vitamins v. France). The ECJ held that Directive 2002/46/EC must be interpreted as meaning that it precludes the setting of maximum amounts of vitamins and minerals, which may be used in the manufacture of food supplements where, in the absence of a genuine risk to human health, upper safe limits have not been established for those vitamins and minerals, unless such a measure is justified in accordance with the precautionary principle. A scientific risk assessment must reveal that scientific uncertainty persists as regards the existence or extent of genuine risks to human health.

As to the commercial implications, it is obvious that food supplements firms that supply different markets (in EU Member States or elsewhere in the world) have to develop different formulations for each market, depending on how the maximum permitted amounts of nutrients have been established (*i.e.*, not necessarily as upper safe limits). The EU Commission has repeatedly declared that it has initiated activities for the establishment of harmonised maximum amounts of vitamins and minerals in food supplements. The measures shall be proposed and later adopted by the EU Commission, assisted by a Regulatory Procedure with Scrutiny Committee composed of the representatives of the Member States (*i.e.*, a regulatory procedure with scrutiny by the EU Parliament and the EU Council). Until then, a harmonised set of rules is not in force amongst EU Member States and operators are confronted with different rules in different markets. The EU seems to plan to establish upper safe limits for vitamins and minerals in food supplements, in consideration of RDAs but not based on RDAs, but there is no certainty regarding the details as no concrete proposal has yet been tabled and the timeframe is uncertain. Developments should, therefore, be closely monitored, particularly for the purposes of assessing whether a future proposal is in line with the relevant Codex Standard.

China criticised at the WTO for failing to open its financial services market

At a 31 October 2011 meeting of the WTO Committee on Trade in Financial Services, China was reportedly urged to take stronger steps to implement the financial service liberalisation commitments it assumed when it became a Member of the WTO in 2001. Representatives of the US, the EU and Japan apparently questioned the validity of China's restrictions on foreign ownership of Chinese banks and insurance companies, as well as China's commitment to provide clear and transparent banking regulations. The US reportedly

argued, *inter alia*, that China had previously agreed that qualified foreign financial institutions would be permitted to establish jointly-owned banks with Chinese partners, and did not schedule any limitations on the percentage of foreign ownership in these banks. The US claimed that China has, in fact, limited the sale of equity stakes in Chinese banks to foreign investors. China apparently responded by denying that it ever made binding commitments regarding foreign acquisitions of its banks.

The reported remarks by the US formed part of the 9th and final WTO review of China's progress in implementing the commitments the country made when it acceded to the WTO in 2001. Section 18 of Part I of the Accession Protocol of China to the WTO, known as the '*Transitional Review Mechanism*', calls for an annual review of the implementation by China of its WTO commitments under the covered agreements and its Accession Protocol. This review was to be conducted annually during the first eight years following China's accession to the WTO, and then once more during the tenth year following China's accession. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of the '*Transitional Review Mechanism*' state that this review was to be conducted by the WTO General Council and the other subsidiary bodies of the WTO which have a mandate regarding China's commitments under the WTO covered agreements or the Accession Protocol of China to the WTO (*e.g.*, including, *inter alia*, the Committee on Trade in Financial Services).

Prior to China's accession to the WTO, the country maintained rigorous geographical restrictions on the permitted presence of foreign banks, which were barred from performing financial operations with local currency outside of Pudong and Shenzhen. As the banking sector of China was of particular interest for developed countries, in the course of its WTO accession China undertook extensive commitments to liberalise its banking market upon the expiry of a five-year transition period. All quantitative limits on banking licenses should thus have been eliminated. The Accession Protocol of China to the WTO also fixed specific criteria of eligibility to perform different kinds of currency operations; these criteria relate to the total value of the assets of the foreign financial establishment and/or its operational experience in China. In order to comply with such conditions, foreign banks must be permitted *to establish* their subsidiary or a foreign finance company in China.

Although the full content of the 31 October 2011 meeting of the WTO Committee on Trade in Financial Services is not yet publicly known, the alleged failure of China to comply with its specific financial services commitments has previously been discussed in the WTO Committee on Trade in Financial Services. In 2006, in the course of the annual '*Transitional Review Mechanism*', the US and Japan stated that China's restrictions on foreign equity participation go contrary to China's WTO obligations. In response to those claims, China insisted that its measures were in full conformity with its WTO obligations. In China's view, it had indeed committed to allow qualified foreign financial institutions *to establish* joint ventures with local banks. However, the issue of foreign equity participation was more an issue of cross-border mergers and acquisition, which was considered to lie '*beyond the scope of China's WTO commitments*'. China thus suggested that its WTO commitments should be read to cover only the establishment of new joint ventures, while foreign investment in existing Chinese banks was not covered by its WTO commitments. Thus, the contentious issue between China and other WTO Members appears to centre on the interpretation of the term '*to establish*' a subsidiary as used in the Accession Protocol of China to the WTO. A WTO panel may eventually adjudicate this issue. Here, it should be noted that a narrow interpretation of the term may be excessively restrictive: following long debates over the course of the Uruguay Round, negotiators agreed that '*commercial presence*' should cover foreign participation in both new and existing establishments. The intention to capture mergers and acquisitions under this mode of cross-border services supply was reflected in the definition of '*commercial presence*' as fixed in Article XXVIII(d)(i) of the General Agreement on Trade in Services. Thus, it could be argued that China's commitments to allow the establishment of '*commercial presence*' could not be limited to the

creation of new ventures, and should be effectively interpreted as extending to cross-border acquisitions.

China's financial services market is seen as a highly attractive – and largely protected – market by many foreign banks and institutions. For instance, China's insurance market alone is believed to have doubled in size between 2006 to 2008 to over 80 billion USD. It has been estimated that by 2013, the expected profits from the consumer credit industry alone could total 7.3 billion USD. Yet access to these markets has been difficult for foreign service suppliers, demonstrated recently by the US decision to initiate a WTO dispute settlement proceeding regarding China's treatment of US suppliers of electronic payment services (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 4 of 25 February 2011). Lobbying their governments to act through the available WTO procedures is one manner in which interested EU commercial parties may be able to assert their interests in China's foreign services market. Given that 26 out of 27 EU Member States currently have bilateral investment protection treaties with China, invoking their investor protection rights under these treaties may be another way by which EU commercial parties could assert their commercial interests. The EU is currently considering negotiating an EU-wide bilateral investment treaty, and the provisions of any eventual bilateral investment treaty may offer EU commercial parties an additional means for asserting their commercial interests in the Chinese financial services market.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1093/2011 of 28 October 2011 on the application of derogations from the rules of origin laid down in the Protocol on the definition of originating products attached to the Free Trade Agreement between the European Union and its Member States and Korea*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1084/2011 of 27 October 2011 amending and correcting Regulation (EC) No. 1235/2008, laying down detailed rules for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No. 834/2007 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from third countries*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1090/2011 of 27 October 2011 on the issue of licences for importing rice under the tariff quotas opened for the October 2011 subperiod by Regulation (EC) No. 327/98*

- *Council Regulation (EU) No. 1071/2011 of 20 October 2011 repealing Regulation (EEC) No. 3448/80 on the implementation of Article 43 of the 1979 Act of Accession, concerning the system of trade applicable to the goods covered by Regulations (EEC) No. 3033/80 and (EEC) No. 3035/80*

- *Council Decision of 20 October 2011 on the conclusion of the Agreement on certain aspects of air services between the European Union and the United Mexican States*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1053/2011 of 20 October 2011 on the issue of import licences and the allocation of import rights for applications lodged during the first seven days of October 2011 under the tariff quotas opened by Regulation (EC) No. 616/2007 for poultrymeat*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1054/2011 of 20 October 2011 on the issue of import licences for applications submitted in the first seven days of October 2011 under the tariff quota for high-quality beef administered by Regulation (EC) No. 620/2009*

- *Decision of the Council and of the Representatives of the Governments of the Member States of the European Union, meeting within the Council of 16 June 2011 on the signing, on behalf of the Union, and provisional application of the Air Transport Agreement between the United States of America, of the first part, the European Union and its Member States, of the second part, Iceland, of the third part, and the Kingdom of Norway, of the fourth part; and on the signing, on behalf of the Union, and provisional application of the Ancillary Agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the first part, Iceland, of the second part, and the Kingdom of Norway, of the third part, on the application of the Air Transport Agreement between the United States of America, of the first part, the European Union and its Member States, of the second part, Iceland, of the third part, and the Kingdom of Norway, of the fourth part*

- *Revised Air Transport Agreement*

- *Ancillary Agreement between the European Union and its Member States, of the first part, Iceland, of the second part, and the Kingdom of Norway, of the third part, on the application of the Air Transport Agreement between the United States of America, of the first part, the European Union and its Member States, of the second part, Iceland, of the third part, and the Kingdom of Norway, of the fourth part*

Trade Remedies

- *Notice of initiation of an anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of certain tube and pipe fittings of iron or steel originating in Russia and Turkey*

Customs Law

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 1006/2011 of 27 September 2011 amending Annex I to Council Regulation (EEC) No. 2658/87 on the tariff and statistical nomenclature and on the Common Customs Tariff*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1102/2011 of 31 October 2011 fixing the import duties in the cereals sector applicable from 1 November 2011*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1103/2011 of 31 October 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 Decision of 27 October 2011 amending Decision 98/536/EC establishing the list of national reference laboratories for the detection of residues (notified under document C(2011) 7610)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1085/2011 of 27 October 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No. 501/2008 laying down detailed rules for the application of Council Regulation (EC) No. 3/2008 on information provision and promotion measures for agricultural products on the internal market and in third countries*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1092/2011 of 27 October 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 Decision of 26 October 2011 amending Decision 2009/821/EC as regards the lists of border inspection posts and veterinary units in Traces (notified under document C(2011) 7564)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 1076/2011 of 24 October 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. 1059/2011 of 20 October 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. 1060/2011 of 20 October 2011 fixing representative prices in the poultrymeat and egg sectors and for egg albumin, and amending Regulation (EC) No. 1484/95*

- *Position (EU) No. 11/2011 of the Council at first reading with a view to the adoption of a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council concerning the making available on the market and use of biocidal products*

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