FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 6 of 25 March 2011

Call for sanctions against Faroe Islands and Iceland in the Mackerel dispute

Mackerel has grown in popularity over time and is regarded as an excellent source of omega-3 fatty acids and vitamin B12. Talks held in Oslo between the EU, Iceland and Norway on 9 - 11 March 2011, in order to find a solution to the so-called 'Mackerel war', have failed. At the end of 2010, after the previous quota talks failed, Iceland unilaterally raised its Mackerel fishing quota to 146,000 tonnes for 2011 (from 130,000 tonnes in 2010), a much higher increase if compared to the ones applied in previous years. The Faroe Islands, a semi-autonomous Danish territory, have tripled their quota up to 85,000 tonnes. The EU and Norway have a common position in the dispute, while Iceland can count on the support of the Faroe Islands. New quota proposals were apparently put on the table; however, the parties could not reach an agreement. Iceland and the Faroe Islands argue that the Mackerel stock has gravitated north in recent years (due to climate change) so they are now fishing in their own zones.

The EU, Iceland, Norway and the Faroe Islands generally come to agreement on sharing the Total Allowable Catch (hereinafter, TAC) of different fish stocks in order to prevent overfishing. As it was not possible to bring the Faroe Islands and Iceland into such agreement in 2010, the EU and Norway reached a bilateral Mackerel agreement, in conformity with the scientific advice by the International Council for Exploration of the Seas (hereinafter, ICES), a long term management plan and the historical sharing arrangement, setting the 2011 TAC for Mackerel in this region at 646,000 tonnes, up from 572,000 in 2010. ICES is an intergovernmental organisation which aims at promoting and encouraging research and investigations for the study of the sea, particularly as it relates to the living resources thereof. Today, ICES (concerned with the Atlantic Ocean and adjacent seas, primarily the North Atlantic) provides the scientific advice and underpinning for most of the regulators and policy-makers concerned with fisheries and the environment in the Northeast Atlantic and Baltic Sea. ICES has 20 Member Countries (i.e., Belgium, Canada, Denmark (including Greenland and Faroe Islands), Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Spain, Sweden, the UK, and the US). The *ICES Advice 9.4.2 on Mackerel stock in the Northeast Atlantic* of October 2010 provides that following the management plan (agreed by the EU, Norway and Faroe Islands in October 2008) implies a TAC between 592,000 and 646,000 tonnes in 2011, which would lead to a catch reduction of between 31% and 36% compared to the estimated catch in 2010. This 2010 ICES Advice also states that there seems to be environmental influence on the stock and that catch and survey data from recent years indicate that the stock has expanded North-westwards during the summer feeding migration. Further analyses to describe the extent of this possible expansion will be necessary. The change could be a consequence of change in food availability, linked to increased water temperature, and/or increased stock size. Mackerel has recently been commercially fished in areas where it was previously not fished, particularly in Icelandic waters. Catches since 2007 have been considerably in excess of the 2010 ICES Advice, which was based on a previously agreed management plan. This trend is expected to continue.

For the EU and Norway, Council Regulation (EU) No. 57/2011 of 18 January 2011 fixes the fishing opportunities for 2011 in relation to certain fish stocks and groups of fish stocks, applicable in EU waters and, for EU vessels, in certain non-EU waters. Article 35 on fishing opportunities for third-country vessels in EU waters provides that fishing vessels flying the flag of Norway and fishing vessels registered in the Faroe Islands shall be authorised to make catches in EU waters within the TACs set out in Annex I to this Regulation and subject to the conditions provided for in this Title and in Chapter III of Regulation (EC) No. 1006/2008 (concerning authorisations for fishing activities of Community fishing vessels outside EU waters and the access of third country vessels to EU waters). Council Regulation (EU) No. 57/2011 fixes, in particular, catch limits applicable to the year 2011 for the species Mackerel (*Scomber scombrus*) in the different fishing zones of the EU and Norway. Council Regulation (EU) No. 57/2011 sets out that, in accordance with the agreements or protocols on fisheries relations with Norway, the Faroe Islands and Greenland, the EU has held consultations on fishing rights with those partners. The consultations with the Faroe Islands have not been finalised and the arrangements for 2011 with that partner are expected to be concluded in early 2011. In order to avoid interruption of EU fishing activities, while allowing for the necessary flexibility to conclude those arrangements in early 2011, it was deemed appropriate for the EU to establish the fishing opportunities for stocks subject to the agreement with the Faroe Islands on a provisional basis.

Together with EU and Norwegian quotas, the increased Icelandic and Faroe Islands' quotas will likely result in 2011 in total catches set to exceed the catches advised by ICES. As ICES points out, the absence of effective international agreements on the exploitation of the stock (between all nations involved in the fishery) is a cause for continued concern and prevents control of the exploitation rate. The management plan agreed by the EU, Norway and Faroe Islands has not been followed in recent years. The question is how to share the access to the Mackerel resource between different fleets, or countries, so that the overall rate of fishing remains sustainable. A fair and sustainable solution on the allocation of Mackerel, which takes into account the legitimate interests of all the parties, seems difficult to achieve. ICES has indicated in its 2010 Advice that the Mackerel stock has, in fact, expanded North-westwards. However, the global warming argument is not accepted by all parties. After its major banks collapsed in 2008, Iceland's economy is now largely fishing-based and a recent fall in the herring catch meant that an increase of the Mackerel quota was even more needed.

Mackerel is also the most valuable stock to the Scottish fishing industry. In 2009, it was estimated to be worth GBP 135 million, which represented about a third of the value of landings by Scottish fleet. In particular, Scottish fishermen have now called for immediate sanctions against Iceland and the Faroe Islands. Sanctions on Iceland (*i.e.*, banning the landings of Mackerel by Icelandic vessels in EU ports) are possible under Article 5 of Protocol 9 of the EEA Agreement under which '*a Contracting Party may refuse landings of fish from a fish stock of common interest over the management of which there is serious disagreement*'. The European Economic Area (EEA) groups the 27 EU Member States along with Iceland, Norway and Liechtenstein. However, in practice, Iceland does not seem to land much Mackerel in EU ports. According to Eurostat, imports of fresh or chilled Mackerel from Iceland are very rare (around 1 tonne in 2008 and 400 kg in 2009 and in 2010). Imports are mainly frozen (330 tonnes in 2008, 164 tonnes in 2009 and 2,696 tonnes in 2010). Thus, sanctions against Iceland under the EEA Agreement would be rather symbolic.

The Faroe Islands, on the other hand, land more fresh or chilled Mackerel in EU ports (1,561 tonnes in 2007, 1,123 tonnes in 2008, 476 tonnes in 2009 and 801 tonnes in 2010). However, it appears that sanctions cannot be applied under the EEA Agreement because of their nature of a self-governing territory within Denmark and since the Faroe Islands are not part of the EU. This is explicitly stated in Article 355(5)(a) of the Treaty on the Functioning of

the EU. Therefore, the Faroe Islands are also not part of the EEA. Currently, the relationship of the Faroe Islands with the EU is governed by two bilateral agreements, a fisheries agreement and a free trade agreement. The bilateral fisheries agreement provides for a mechanism to resolve disputes, but such instrument is one with no much 'teeth'.

Careful analysis, however, should be conducted in order to assess the relevant WTO rules (and related EU instruments) that could be invoked. While Iceland is a full WTO Member, the Faroe Islands do not hold separate WTO Membership or Observer status at the WTO. However, it appears that the Faroe Islands are in principle covered by the WTO legal framework as a result of the fact that they are a constituent territory of Denmark and Denmark did not submit any territorial reservations when it joined the WTO on 1 January 1995.

The question of the possible applicable trade instruments and, if need be, meaningful sanctions (*i.e.*, an EU-wide ban on all Faroese and Icelandic fish has been advocated by some) against Iceland and the Faroe Islands is not an easy one due to the complex jurisdictional issues involved, but it appears worth considering by the parties that are being negatively affected. The EU is the main market for both Iceland and Faroe Islands. Both countries' economies are heavily reliant on fisheries exports. It looks as if trade and legal instruments will soon add to the scientific and political debate surrounding Mackerel and the sustainable management of this important resource.

Norway requests the establishment of a WTO panel regarding the EU's ban on Norwegian seal products

On 15 March 2011, Norway requested the establishment of a WTO panel concerning the EU's ban on the import of seal products. Canada submitted a similar request on 11 February 2011 (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 4 of 25 February 2011). Norway's request will be heard at the next meeting of the WTO's Dispute Settlement Body on 25 March 2011.

On 5 November 2009, Norway requested formal WTO consultations with the EU concerning the EU's implementation of Regulation (EC) No. 1007/09 of 16 September 2009 (hereinafter, the Seals Regulation). According to the Seals Regulation, adopted by the EU Council on 26 July 2009, seal products are permitted to be placed on the EU market only in limited, largely non-commercial, circumstances, including, *inter alia*, where the seal products result from hunts traditionally conducted by Inuit and other native communities. Article 3 of the Seals Regulation clarifies that the restrictions apply '*at the time or point of import*'. Therefore, the Seals Regulation effectively results in an import ban on most Norwegian seal products.

On 20 November 2009, Canada requested to join the consultations. Norway and Canada held consultations with the EU on 15 December 2009. The consultations were unsuccessful, and on 20 August 2010 the EU adopted Regulation (EC) No. 737/2010 (hereinafter, the Seal Ban Implementing Regulation) to implement the seal import ban. Norway responded by renewing its consultations request on 19 October 2010. Norway claims that the Seal Ban Implementing Regulation does not establish adequate procedures for assessing the conformity of imported seal products with the relevant conditions for placing these products on the EU market. Norway also argues that the exceptions to the seal import ban appear to discriminate in favour of seal products originating in the EU and in certain third countries. Norway and Canada held supplementary consultations with the EU in December 2010. These consultations were again unsuccessful, leading to the present request by Norway for the establishment of a WTO dispute resolution panel.

The legal arguments offered by Norway in support of its request for the establishment of a WTO panel are almost identical to those outlined in Canada's request in the parallel dispute

(see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 4 of 25 February 2011). One difference, however, is that Norway argues that the EU has violated Article 5.4 of the TBT Agreement by failing to base its conformity assessment procedures on relevant guides or recommendations completed, or about to be completed, by international standardising bodies. Canada did not invoke this argument in its request for the establishment of a WTO panel. In order to pursue its argument based on Article 5.4 of the TBT Agreement, Norway would have to argue that the EU's seal importation conformity requirements are not based on a guide or set of recommendations published, or soon to be published, by an international body such as the International Organisation for Standardization (hereinafter, ISO). The EU may respond by noting that, although Sub-group 65.145 of the ISO's International Classification for Standards provides standards for regulating animal killing and restraining traps, it provides no standards pertaining to general hunting methods used to kill seals or other animals. The EU may also invoke a permitted exception from international standards under Article 5.4 of the TBT Agreement by claiming that such guides or recommendations are inappropriate for the EU's objective of protecting '*animal ... life or health*'.

The current commercial contributions of sealing to the Norwegian economy are limited. According to the Norwegian Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs, the Norwegian sealing industry has depended for its survival on government subsidies since 1991. The sealing industry does, however, represent for Norway a traditional industry that is thousands of years old. In 2005, the Norwegian Government authorised the demonstration of seal hunting practices to foreign tourists. These historical investments may complicate the resolution of the sealing dispute between Norway and the EU. By contrast, Canada may be able to resolve its sealing dispute with the EU within the framework of the ongoing EU – Canada FTA negotiations towards a Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 2 of 28 January 2011). Interested commercial parties should continue to monitor how these sealing disputes evolve within the WTO dispute resolution process.

The EU and Malaysia could conclude FTA negotiations by June 2012

Progress is continuing in the FTA negotiations between the EU and Malaysia. On 14 March 2011, both parties announced that they hope to conclude the FTA negotiations by June 2012. Malaysia is currently the EU's second-largest trading partner within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (hereinafter, ASEAN, which comprises, in addition to Malaysia, Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam). Two-way trade between the EU and Malaysia totalled 31.9 billion EUR in 2010. EU – Malaysian trade primarily consists of trade in goods: in 2010, the EU exported 11.2 billion EUR worth of goods to Malaysia, while Malaysian exports of goods to the EU equalled 20.7 billion EUR. Under the EU's Generalised System of Preferences (hereinafter, GSP), over 70% of Malaysia's exports to the EU enter duty-free, and Malaysia enjoys a trade surplus with most EU Member States. Total bilateral trade in services between the EU and Malaysia is relatively modest, totalling approximately 3.5 billion EUR in 2009.

The EU – Malaysian FTA talks were originally launched on 10 September 2010 (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 18 of 8 October 2010) in the wake of the EU's stalled FTA talks with ASEAN. Two rounds of FTA talks have been held with Malaysia since December 2010, and a third round of talks is scheduled for May 2011. In anticipation of further FTAs with ASEAN countries, the EU is reportedly seeking a wide-ranging FTA with Malaysia which covers trade in goods, technical standards, services, investment, intellectual property, and the liberalisation of government procurement.

Reports suggest that the EU aims, in particular, at reducing Malaysian barriers to EU exports of automotive and alcoholic goods. In addition, the EU is pursuing greater services

liberalisation, aiming to lift the foreign equity caps that Malaysia currently applies in the financial services sector (30%), and in other services sectors (20%). Malaysia is aware that its growing economy (7.2% GDP growth in 2010) may soon make it ineligible for the EU's GSP. Malaysia is attempting to achieve high-income status by 2020 by shifting its economy further up the value-added production chain. To this end, Malaysia seeks additional European investment in its high technology industries, biotechnology sector, and services industry.

Malaysia may also use the FTA talks to address its concerns that the sustainability criteria in the EU's Renewable Energy Directive may restrict EU – Malaysian trade (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 10 of 21 May 2010, and Issue No. 18 of 8 October 2010). In order to meet the EU's climate change and energy policy objectives, this EU Directive establishes, *inter alia*, sustainability criteria for the use of energy from biofuels (used for transport purposes) and bioliquids (used for electricity, heating and cooling purposes) derived from renewable sources. Malaysia has voiced concerns that such criteria might effectively lead to an EU import ban on biofuel produced from Malaysian palm oil, and thus violate Article XI of the GATT (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 10 of 21 May 2010).

The liberalisation of Malaysia's government procurement market appears to be the most sensitive issue within the ongoing FTA talks. Malaysia's economy relies heavily on exports, and falling external demand for consumer goods limited Malaysia's economic growth in 2009. Malaysia also suffered a steep decline in inward investment flows in 2009: reports indicate that foreign direct investment fell by 50% compared to 2008 levels. Malaysia's Government responded by undertaking policies to increase investment, including, *inter alia*, raising the possibility of revising Malaysia's government procurement policies, which explicitly favour the country's ethnic Malays. The Malays are considered by Malaysia to be an economically-marginalised ethnic group. Most state contracts are awarded to ethnic Malays under a state affirmative action programme. This policy has reportedly prevented EU Member States from bidding on many Malaysian State contracts.

Liberalisation of government procurement has proved to be so sensitive for Malaysia that it was excluded from the country's FTAs with Japan, New Zealand and India. Disagreements over government procurement liberalisation also apparently stalled Malaysia's FTA talks with the US. Nevertheless, EU officials have expressed optimism that a deal can be reached whereby EU companies gain greater access to Malaysian government procurement in return for greater Malaysian access to EU government procurement contracts reportedly worth more than 300 billion EUR.

A successful conclusion of the EU – Malaysian FTA talks stands to have substantial big-picture commercial implications for both Malaysia and the EU. Reports have suggested that a FTA with the EU could boost Malaysia's GDP by up to 8% by 2020. The EU would also enjoy significant long-term benefits: the negotiation of FTAs with leading ASEAN countries such as Singapore and Malaysia 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. Such a bridge would connect the EU to a geopolitical and economic organisation with a population of approximately 600 million and a combined GDP of almost 2 trillion USD.

Canadian compositional cheese standards upheld on appeal

On 28 February 2011, the Canadian Federal Court of Appeal dismissed a request by Kraft Canada and Saputo for judicial review of a Federal Court decision which challenged on constitutional and administrative law grounds provisions of the Federal Food and Drug Regulations, as well as provisions of the Federal Dairy Products Regulations. These

regulations prescribe that cheese imported into Canada or produced in Canada and marketed in international or interprovincial trade must have a certain percentage of casein content derived from liquid milks, and not from other milk products such as whey cream or milk powder (the 'Casein Ratios'); and a whey protein to casein ratio that does not exceed the ratio of whey protein to casein ratio of milk (the 'Whey Ratio'). These provisions came into force on 14 December 2008.

Kraft Canada and Saputo argued that the essential purpose of these regulations was to support dairy producers by requiring the use of additional liquid milk in the production of cheese, with resulting substantial impacts on milk supply costs for dairy processors. According to Kraft and Saputo, this purpose had nothing to do with international or interprovincial trade, and the regulations were thus outside of the constitutional authority of the Canadian Federal Government to regulate trade and commerce. The Federal Court judge ruled that the impugned regulations were validly adopted under the constitutional powers of the Federal Government in that '*cheese products marketed in import, export or interprovincial trade were already subject to detailed regulation under the Dairy Products Regulations and the Food and Drug Regulations as to their compositional standards, notably through standards concerning the maximum percentage of moisture and the minimum percentage of milk fat for various cheese products, and standards related to other ingredients which may be contained in various cheese types. The impugned Regulations now add to these compositional standards by requiring that cheese contain a minimum percentage of milk protein derived from liquid milk, the Casein Ratios, and by also requiring that the whey protein to casein ratio in cheese not exceed the ratio of whey protein to casein of milk, the Whey Ratio'*.

The Federal Court of Appeal also noted that the impugned regulations were a response to consumer expectations for consistent organoleptic, chemical and physical properties of cheese. These consumer expectations were at risk of being affected by technological advances in cheese-making that allowed for the inclusion of higher levels of other milk solids in the manufacture of cheese. The Federal Court of Appeal accepted the findings of the Federal Court that cheese smell, taste and texture could be affected by the use of even small quantities of substitutes to liquid milk products. However, the Federal Court of Appeal also noted that the impugned regulations allowed for technological advances in cheese production through compositional requirements which permit, to a limited extent, new technology proteins in cheese content.

The Federal Court of Appeal also found that one of the important purposes of the impugned regulations was to ensure greater consistency with certain international food standards. In particular, the Court noted that the impugned regulations mirrored Section 2.1 of the Codex General Standard for Cheese. In fact, the Codex General Standard for Cheese (CODEX STAN 283-1978), as revised in 1999 and last amended in 2010, defines cheese as '*the ripened or unripened soft, semi-hard, hard, or extra-hard product, which may be coated, and in which the whey protein/casein ratio does not exceed that of milk, (...)*'. The standard further states that standards for individual varieties of cheese, or groups of varieties of cheese, may contain provisions which are more specific than those in this Standard and in these cases, those specific provisions shall apply. Codex has adopted standards for whey cheese, cheese in brine, unripened cheese including fresh cheese, extra hard grading cheese, Mozzarella, Cheddar, Danbo, Edam, Gouda, Havarti, Samsoe, Emmental, Tilsiter, Saint-Paulin, Provolone, Cottage Cheese incl. Creamed Cottage Cheese, Coulommiers, Cream Cheese, Camembert, and Brie.

In practice, the companies mentioned above are already complying with the regulations that came into effect in December 2008. However, there seems to be a financial impact. Kraft, Saputo and (at the time) Parmalat Canada had long argued that the new rules would increase their production costs, raise the price of cheese to consumers, and produce large

benefits to dairy producers from higher milk sales. Saputo and Kraft Canada are weighing whether they will appeal this decision further to the Supreme Court of Canada.

In the EU, there is no harmonised compositional standard for cheese. 'Cheese' basically means '*products covered by CN code 0406*'. There are different standards at Member States level. For example, the German Cheese Regulation Käseverordnung of 14 April 1986, last amended on 17 December 2010 defines cheese in § 1 as '*products which are fresh or in different degrees of maturity, made from coagulated cheese milk*' (*i.e.*, '*Käse sind frische oder in verschiedenen Graden der Reife befindliche Erzeugnisse, die aus dickgelegter Käsereimilch hergestellt sind*'). There are also specific rules on whey and casein.

The question is what effect (if any) these regulations may have on EU – Canada trade. While, according to Eurostat figures, in 2005 Canada exported 4,081 tonnes of cheese (almost exclusively cheddar cheese) to the EU (4,104 in 2006, 4,263 in 2007, 4,224 in 2008 and 2,843 in 2009), the exports went down to 1,050 tonnes in 2010. In comparison, the EU exports more cheese to Canada. In particular, between 2005 and 2010, the EU exported roughly 15,000 tonnes of cheese each year to Canada. The Canadian Regulations upheld by Canada's Federal Court of Appeal, which apply since December 2008, do not seem to have had so far an economic effect on stable EU exports to Canada. Therefore, it is unlikely that this can become an issue in the current CETA negotiations, where Canadian protection of dairy stands out as a key negotiating issue.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 281/2011 of 21 March 2011 on the issue of import licences for applications lodged during the first seven days of March 2011 under the tariff quotas opened by Regulation (EC) No 539/2007 for certain products in the egg sector and for egg albumin*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 280/2011 of 21 March 2011 on the issue of import licences for applications submitted in the first seven days of March 2011 under the tariff quota for high-quality beef administered by Regulation (EC) No 620/2009*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 279/2011 of 21 March 2011 fixing the allocation coefficient for the issuing of import licences applied for from 1 to 7 March 2011 for sugar products under certain tariff quotas and suspending submission of applications for such licences*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 278/2011 of 21 March 2011 on the issue of import licences for applications lodged during the first seven days of March 2011 under the tariff quota opened by Regulation (EC) No 1385/2007 for poultrymeat*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 277/2011 of 21 March 2011 on the issue of import licences for applications lodged during the first seven days of March 2011 under the tariff quotas opened by Regulation (EC) No 533/2007 for poultrymeat*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No 257/2011 of 16 March 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 616/2007 opening and providing for the administration of*

Community tariff quotas in the sector of poultrymeat originating in Brazil, Thailand and other third countries

- *Council Decision of 14 March 2011 establishing the position to be taken by the European Union within the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties of the Rotterdam Convention as regards the amendments to Annex III to the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for certain hazardous chemicals and pesticides in international trade*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No 252/2011 of 15 March 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) as regards Annex I*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No 253/2011 of 15 March 2011 amending Regulation (EC) No 1907/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the Registration, Evaluation, Authorisation and Restriction of Chemicals (REACH) as regards Annex XIII*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 292/2011 of 23 March 2011 fixing allocation coefficient, rejecting further applications and closing the period for submitting applications for available quantities of out-of-quota isoglucose to be sold on the Union market at reduced surplus levy*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 293/2011 of 23 March 2011 fixing allocation coefficient, rejecting further applications and closing the period for submitting applications for available quantities of out-of-quota sugar to be sold on the Union market at reduced surplus levy*

Trade Remedies

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No 258/2011 of 16 March 2011 imposing a provisional anti-dumping duty on imports of ceramic tiles originating in the People's Republic of China*

- *Commission notice concerning parties exempted, pursuant to Commission Regulation (EC) No 88/97 on the authorisation of the exemption of imports of certain bicycle parts originating in the People's Republic of China from the extension by Council Regulation (EC) No 71/97 of the anti-dumping duty imposed by Council Regulation (EEC) No 2474/93, maintained by Council Regulation (EC) No 1524/2000 and last amended by Council Regulation (EC) No 1095/2005: changes in the name and address of certain exempted parties*

- *Notice of the expiry of certain anti-dumping measures (2011/C 82/04)*

- *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 248/2011 of 9 March 2011 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty and collecting definitively the provisional duty imposed on imports of certain continuous filament glass fibre products originating in the People's Republic of China*

- *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No 287/2011 of 21 March 2011 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of tungsten carbide, tungsten carbide simply mixed with metallic powder and fused tungsten carbide originating in the*

People's Republic of China following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Regulation (EC) No 1225/2009

Customs Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 266/2011 of 17 March 2011 fixing the export refunds on poultrymeat*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 265/2011 of 17 March 2011 fixing the export refunds on beef and veal*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No 259/2011 of 16 March 2011 amending Regulation (EU) No 642/2010 on rules of application (cereal sector import duties) for Council Regulation (EC) No 1234/2007*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 262/2011 of 16 March 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 256/2011 of 15 March 2011 fixing the import duties in the cereals sector applicable from 16 March 2011*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 255/2011 of 15 March 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 251/2011 of 14 March 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 246/2011 of 11 March 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*

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