FRATINIVERGANO
EUROPEAN LAWYERS
TRADE PERSPECTIVES©

Issue No. 18 of 7 October 2011

Danish tax on saturated fat in some food comes into effect, within a trend in EU Member States to impose taxes on certain food categories

To discourage unhealthy eating and to limit the population's intake of fatty foods, Denmark has introduced a tax on foods that are high in saturated fat. On 1 October 2011, the Danish *fedtafgiftsloven* (Fat Tax Act, hereinafter, Act), full title: *Lov om afgift af mættet fedt i visse fødevarer* (Act on a tax on saturated fat in specific food), came into effect. The tax of DKK 16 (around EUR 2.15) per kilogram of saturated fat is imposed on food products both produced in and imported into Denmark. According to the scope of the new legislation, established in Article 1 of the Act, the following products are taxable: meat, certain dairy products, animal fats, edible oils and other fats, margarine, spreadable composite products, and other products, which can be considered as substitutes or imitations of the above. The tax does not apply to products containing less than 2.3% per weight of saturated fat, which means that most types of milk are exempt. Goods for export, animal feed, additives, certain food supplements and medicines are also exempt.

The obligation to pay the tax is incumbent upon those who (commercially) produce the food in Denmark, receive the food from another EU country, import food into Denmark from a country outside the EU or from areas located in the EU, but which are not included in the EU's fiscal territory, or sell food from another EU country in such a way that the goods are directly or indirectly sent or are transported by the seller or on behalf of the seller to a non-commercial purchaser in Denmark (*i.e.*, distance selling) (hereinafter, the taxable parties). Both producers and importers of these goods must register for the tax on saturated fat with the Danish Customs and Tax Administration. The base amount on which the tax is to be paid is the weight of saturated fat in the food. For meat products, standard rates per kilogram have been set in an Annex to the Act (for example, for beef with a saturated fat content per 100g of 5.2g, the tax per kg of beef is DKK 0.83=EUR 0.11), but under certain conditions the tax can also be paid according to the saturated fat content in a cut. There are several options to determine the base amount on which the tax is to be paid. The taxable party can use publicly available food information, which sets average standards for the levels of saturated fat in specific food. The base amount can also be determined upon a technical analysis of the specific food. Finally, nutrition labelling can be used. Nutrition labelling is currently not mandatory in the EU, but it will be. A mandatory nutrition declaration (including the indication of saturated fat per 100g or 100ml in a product), will have to be implemented by operators within a five-year period after the EU Food Information Regulation (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 14 of 15 July 2011), which has been adopted by the EU Council in September 2011, comes into effect (on the 20th day following its publication in the Official Journal).

The Danish fat tax also applies to imported products. Article 8 of the Act establishes that, where such food is received, imported or sold by distance selling in Denmark, a tax is to be paid to the treasury on the constituents used in the production of food, where these

constituents originate from the taxable food. Danish importers of covered products must therefore obtain a declaration from the foreign supplier. Where taxable parties are unable to document the weight of saturated fat, the tax is to be paid based on the total amount of both saturated and unsaturated fat in the food or, if this also cannot be provided, on the basis of the food product's net weight. Fines will be imposed on anyone who knowingly or recklessly submits incorrect or misleading information.

It can be expected that the taxable parties will ultimately pass on the tax to the final consumer. The implementation of the tax scheme seems to be quite bureaucratic for producers, importers and outlets as the establishment of the amount of the tax on domestically produced or imported goods is burdensome. It requires, for example, declarations from producers both as to how much saturated fat was in the product itself and how much was used in its preparation. In addition, it has been reported that Denmark reserves the right to impose a flat fee on the importer when the fat content of an imported product is not sufficiently indicated.

The Danish Act is another example of a trend in various EU Member States to tax certain foods or consider taxing them in the future. On 1 September 2011, Hungary introduced a tax on products considered excessively salty, sweet or with high caffeine levels, also known as *'chips tax' (chipsadó)*, which is levied on the producer or first distributor. To change Hungarian eating habits and combat obesity, manufacturers of carbonated soft drinks, energy drinks, pre-packaged sweet biscuits and salty snacks have to pay various levies depending on the sugar and salt content of foods and drinks. The original legislation had also targeted traditional Hungarian food such as sausages, salami and a wide variety of lard but these were finally exempted. The French Government will increase taxes on soft drinks in 2012. The Irish Government is also considering (in view of the French tax) to introduce a tax on carbonated soft drinks to help combat obesity. Finally, the UK's Prime Minister has announced this week that he is considering the possibility of introducing a Danish-style fat tax to address obesity.

The Danish fat tax, the Hungarian *'chips tax'* and similar measures, which might be introduced in individual EU Member States, appear to be indirect internal taxes that are not harmonised at EU level. As a general rule, EU Member States may introduce and maintain non-harmonised internal taxes and freely establish their modalities. However, such taxes must comply with the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (hereinafter, TFEU), in particular with Article 110 thereof, which prohibits internal discriminatory taxation, directly or indirectly, on products of other Member States, in excess of that imposed directly or indirectly on similar domestic products. It should be closely analysed whether there is a higher tax burden on imported products subject to these taxes.

Discrimination against third country products could also become an issue in the implementation of such taxes. Article III:2 of the WTO's General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter, the GATT) prevents WTO Members from applying to imported products internal taxes in excess of those applied to domestic products. In addition, it also prohibits internal taxation applied so as to afford protection to domestic production. Although the Danish tax is origin-neutral, instances of discrimination relevant to Denmark's WTO obligations may nevertheless occur where the tax *de facto* favours domestic production of like or '*directly competitive or substitutable*' products. In addition, the Danish tax may have an impact on the international trade in the products concerned to the extent that it subjects imported products to additional certification requirements (to determine the saturated fat content and therefore the tax base), which may be burdensome and cause administrative delays.

Tackling obesity is an important challenge, also for regulators. One question is whether these product-specific taxes are really addressing the obesity problem by penalising certain

'*unhealthy*' products or if they are just new instruments to generate fiscal revenues (or maybe, even, to protect certain domestic constituencies), in particular in view of the public deficit problems that many EU Member States are currently facing in the context of the economic crisis. In addition, it is not clear whether the imposition of such taxes is going to reduce obesity or whether governments would be better off with, for example, education campaigns. The scientific community is not certain about which foods to target. In view of the discrimination among specific food categories, the hope is that, in Europe, the well-known adagio that '*there are no 'bad' foods, only 'bad' diets*' will not become '*there are no 'bad' health policies, only 'bad' trade-related measures*'.

The EU Commission proposed higher '*polluting values*' for tar sand fossil fuels under the EU Fuel Quality Directive

On 4 October 2011, the EU Commission reportedly proposed that oil derived from tar sands be attributed a '*polluting value*' approximately 20% higher than crude oil. This proposal is submitted in the context of the implementing provisions that the EU Commission must develop, together with the EU Member States according to *Comitology*, for the purposes of implementing Article 7(a)(1) of *Directive 98/70/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 October 1998 relating to the quality of petrol and diesel fuels*, as amended by *Directive 2009/30/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 as regards the specifications of petrol, diesel and gas-oil and introducing a mechanism to monitor and reduce greenhouse gas emissions* (hereinafter, the EU Fuel Quality Directive).

In relevant part, the EU Fuel Quality Directive establishes a 6% reduction target for the life-cycle greenhouse gas intensity of transportation fuels by 2020. The reduction target is to be calculated through a comparison between life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions per unit of energy supplied and a fuel baseline standard, based on the EU average level life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions per unit of energy from fossil fuels in 2010. The requirement is based on the premise that every fuel has a life-cycle, which starts at the moment of production and terminates at its combustion, irrespective of where the emissions occur. The scheme, therefore, requires a calculation of life-cycle greenhouse gas intensity of fossil fuels, conducted through the determination of default values for each type of fossil fuel.

The attribution of higher '*polluting values*' to oil from tar sands will likely bear important consequences on trade relations between the EU and Canada, the country currently producing and exporting oil from tar sands (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 9 of 7 May 2010). Within a framework of thresholds placed on the supply and consumption of fossil fuels, the attribution of a higher '*polluting value*', may constitute a potential barrier to trade inasmuch as it would result in discriminatory treatment of the final product (*i.e.*, fossil fuel), *vis-à-vis* other fossil fuels produced in conventional ways on the basis of production methods. Canadian stakeholders have long opposed the creation of separate default values for oil produced from tar sands and argued that overall emissions of the oil from tar sands are comparable to those of heavy oil from Nigeria, Mexico, Russia and Venezuela, for which apparently no separate default values are being proposed.

Under a WTO perspective, an EU regulation creating separate values for oil produced from tar sands (and other unconventional fuels) would most likely conflict with the EU's obligations under the GATT and the WTO Agreement on Technical Barriers to Trade (hereinafter, TBT Agreement). In particular, inasmuch as it may affect the sale, purchase and use of tar sands oil in the EU market *vis-à-vis*, in particular, fossil fuels imported from other WTO Members, the possible allocation of a separate value to oil produced from tar sands may be inconsistent with the most-favoured nation obligation embodied in Article I of the GATT. In addition, such measure may likely constitute a technical barrier to trade within

the meaning of Annex 1:1 of the TBT Agreement. The TBT Agreement allows WTO Members to draw up technical regulations in order to protect the environment. However, Article 2.1 thereof provides that such technical regulations cannot result in discriminatory treatment *vis-à-vis* the like products of national origin or originating in any other country. In this context, a key element for a finding of discrimination under both agreements lies in whether the differences in the production processes may lead to consider oil derived from tar sands '*not like*' oil produced from conventional sources. WTO/GATT case law has, so far, allowed such different treatment only if the process and production method (or PPM) affects the physical characteristics of the final product, so that the oil produced in such manner is not '*like*' the oil produced in other conventional ways. This reading was indirectly confirmed in the recent WTO *US – Tuna II (Mexico)* panel report (see Trade Perspectives, Issue No. 17 of 23 September 2011).

In addition, Article 2.2 of the TBT Agreement requires that technical regulations not result in unnecessary barriers to trade. By creating a trade barrier for oil generated from oil sands (and other unconventional sources) on the basis of their (comparatively-speaking) more polluting production process, such standards may lead to a *de facto* EU ban for this particular type of oil, contrary also to Article XI of the GATT.

Canadian officials are reportedly considering resorting to the WTO dispute settlement system if the EU Commission's proposal is endorsed. This issue may also have an impact on the ongoing EU – Canada FTA negotiations. Canada, which does not currently export its oil to the EU, is particularly concerned that such move may encourage other countries, in particular the US, to take similar steps (see Trade Perspectives, Issues No. 22 of 27 November 2009 and No. 9 of 7 May 2010). The commercial stakes of a possible future EU measure setting separate values for certain types of fuels are high not only for Canada, whose oil sands represent the second largest proven oil reserve in the world and attracted an estimated 10.5 billion CAD in investment in 2010. They are also relevant for other unconventional fuels, such as shale oil, used and produced, *inter alia*, in some EU countries, as well as in China and Brazil, apparently also targeted by the EU Commission's proposal.

The negotiations for the revision of the GPA are close to a conclusion

Reportedly, forty-two countries are close to agreeing to an upgrade of the WTO plurilateral Agreement on Government Procurement (hereinafter, GPA) by the time that the WTO Ministerial Conference takes place in December 2011. It appears that unsolved issues still remain between the EU, Japan and the US. However, trade negotiators believe that the chances of talks to be concluded in December are '*pretty good*'.

The revision and '*update*' of the GPA has been one of the most dynamic fields of negotiations within the WTO. A commitment to further negotiations on public procurement was built in Article XXIV:7(b) and (c) of the current text of the GPA. The purpose of these negotiations is three-fold: (i) to improve and update the GPA in light of developments in information technology and procurement methods; (ii) to expand the coverage of the agreement; and (iii) to eliminate remaining discriminatory measures.

The current text of the GPA sets out the general rules and obligations of the Parties, including the principles of non-discrimination, and the procedural requirements relating to tender procedures. The exact scope and coverage of the obligations of each Party to the GPA, however, is determined by the Appendices to the Agreement. Those Appendices contain the list of national entities whose procurement is subject to the provisions of the GPA, the threshold values above which procurements are covered by the agreement, as well as the lists of sources where Parties publish the notices of intended procurement, the

lists of qualified suppliers in the context of selective tendering, and the applicable procurement rules and procedures.

By the end of 2006, WTO Members Parties to the GPA provisionally agreed on the revision of the main text. In December 2010, following the '*legal check*' and verification of the equivalency of the English, French and Spanish versions, the WTO Secretariat made the current version of the revised text available to the public. However, due to a lack of agreement on the specific obligations to be undertaken by each Party and framed in the Appendices, the revised text could not come into force.

The recently reported progress in the GPA negotiations, therefore, appears to indicate that an agreement on the coverage of the new version of the GPA may be close. If the Parties successfully conclude the negotiations on the Appendices to the new GPA, the provisionally agreed text will finally be adopted. Though the revised text is based predominantly on the same principles and concepts as the current version of the GPA, there are several noteworthy novelties. To begin with, the preamble of the revised text, unlike the preamble of the current version of the GPA, specifically calls for transparency and impartiality of the public procurement regimes for the '*efficient and effective management of public resources*'. Moreover, the preamble of the provisionally agreed text directly refers to '*applicable international instruments, such as the United Nations (hereinafter, UN) Convention against Corruption*'. It should be noted that, while Chinese Taipei is a Party to the GPA, because it being a non-member of the UN, it is unable to sign the UN Convention against Corruption. Furthermore, Oman, one of the WTO Members negotiating accession to the GPA did not sign the UN Convention. Nonetheless, through the preamble of the new text, the conventional instruments to combat corrupt practices may inform the interpretation of the new GPA.

In addition, the revised text introduces the definition of government procurement, thus excluding the situations when certain transactions are considered as falling within the scope of the GPA by one Party and not by the other. Commentators also find Article V:4 of the provisionally agreed text to cater for the use of other tendering procedures in addition to the three basic ones mentioned in the current GPA (*i.e.*, open tendering, selective tendering and limited tendering), if conducted in a transparent and impartial manner. In addition, the revised text strengthens the disciplines for the participation in procurement and improves transparency through enhanced access to information on procurement opportunities: the draft contains the requirement to publish the procurement summary notice in at least one of the official WTO languages and promotes the wider use of electronic sources for publication.

The attention to public procurement disciplines within the framework of international trade regulation has increased substantially in the last decade. The EU Commission estimates that government procurement takes a share of over 10% of GDP in large industrialised countries, and a growing share in the emerging economies, constituting business opportunities in sectors where EU industries are highly competitive. Pressing for more opening of procurement abroad and fighting against discriminatory practices applied by trading partners was declared to be one of the core components of the EU's trade strategy. Strengthened disciplines and commitments on government procurement have been inserted, for example, in the recently concluded EU – South Korea FTA. An enhanced WTO government procurement framework would considerably expand the access of companies to governmental purchases abroad on a wider plurilateral level. Whereas the scale of the real commercial impact of the GPA revision would mainly depend on the specific obligations undertaken by the Parties in the revised Appendices, the adoption of the provisionally agreed text would by all means contribute to transparency and uniformity in application of the GPA rules.

EFSA completed its first opinions providing the scientific basis for the modernisation of meat inspection in the EU

The European Food Safety Authority (hereinafter, EFSA) has completed the first opinions (on swine) that will provide the scientific basis for the modernisation of meat inspection in the EU. EFSA emphasised that any amendments in the EU meat inspection procedures need to include provisions for the control of imports from third countries. In May 2010, the EU Commission had asked EFSA, in accordance with Article 20 of Regulation (EC) No. 854/2004 laying down specific rules for the organisation of official controls on products of animal origin intended for human consumption, to deliver a series of scientific opinions on public health hazards (biological and chemical) to be addressed by meat inspection.

Meat inspection tasks for official veterinarians, established in Annex I, section I of Regulation (EC) No. 854/2004 (last amended by Regulation (EU) No. 739/2011), include: checks and analysis of food chain information; *ante-mortem* inspection, animal welfare; *post-mortem* inspection; specified risk material and other animal by-products; and laboratory testing. The scope of the inspection includes monitoring of zoonotic infections and the detection or confirmation of certain animal diseases without necessarily having consequences for the placing on the market of meat. The purpose of the inspection is to assess if the meat is fit for human consumption in general and to address a number of specific hazards, in particular transmissible spongiform encephalopathies, cysticercosis, trichinosis, glanders, tuberculosis, brucellosis, but also contaminants, residues of veterinary drugs and unauthorised substances or products. On 20 November 2009, the EU Council (in view of an EU Commission report of 28 July 2009 on the experience gained from the application of the EU food hygiene regulations) asked the EU Commission to prepare concrete proposals allowing the effective implementation of modernised sanitary inspection in slaughterhouses, while making full use of the principle of the '*risk-based approach*'. It is within this context, that the EU Commission asked EFSA for the opinions.

In the first set of opinions concerning swine, in the area of biological hazards, EFSA identified in a qualitative risk assessment the food-borne hazards Salmonella, Yersinia enterocolitica, Toxoplasma gondii and Trichinella as priority targets in the inspection of swine meat at abattoir level, due to their prevalence and impact on human health. In the area of chemical substances, EFSA ranked dioxins, dioxin-like polychlorinated biphenyls and the antibiotic chloramphenicol as being of high potential concern in pork. However, EFSA concluded that chemical substances in pork are unlikely to pose an immediate or short term health risk for consumers. EFSA recommended the development of risk-based inspection strategies by means of differentiated sampling plans taking into account food chain information and a regular update of sampling programmes and inclusion of inspection criteria for the identification of illicit use of substances.

In relation to meat imports from third countries, EFSA noted that all measures taken to improve the efficacy of meat inspection protocols need to address the compliance of such imports with these strategies. EFSA emphasised that any amendments in the EU meat inspection procedures need to include provisions for the control of imports from third countries.

The five remaining sets of opinions and reports will cover poultry (expected by the end of June 2012); bovine animals over six weeks old; bovine animals under six weeks old; domestic sheep and goats; farmed game and domestic solipeds (these four sets of opinions are expected by the end of June 2013). The ongoing review of meat inspection in the EU, currently carried out by EFSA (setting the scientific basis) and to be followed by the EU Commission (making regulatory proposals in consideration of EFSA's recommendations), will have a major impact in the modernisation of meat inspection, including meat inspection

carried out in third countries that are exporting or want to export to the EU in the future. Third country governments and operators should monitor these developments closely.

Recently Adopted EU Legislation

Market Access

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 952/2011 of 23 September 2011 on the issue of licences for importing rice under the tariff quotas opened for the September 2011 subperiod by Regulation (EC) No. 327/98*

Trade Remedies

- *Council Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 990/2011 of 3 October 2011 imposing a definitive anti-dumping duty on imports of bicycles originating in the People's Republic of China following an expiry review pursuant to Article 11(2) of Regulation (EC) No. 1225/2009*

- *Notice of initiation of a partial interim review of the anti-dumping measures applicable to imports of certain pre- and post-stressing wires and wire strands of non-alloy steel (PSC wires and strands) originating in the People's Republic of China*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 969/2011 of 29 September 2011 initiating a review of Implementing Regulation of the Council (EU) No. 400/2010 (extending the definitive anti-dumping duty imposed by Regulation (EC) No. 1858/2005 on imports of steel ropes and cables originating, inter alia, in the People's Republic of China to imports of steel ropes and cables consigned from the Republic of Korea, whether declared as originating in the Republic of Korea or not) for the purposes of determining the possibility of granting an exemption from those measures to one Korean exporter, repealing the anti-dumping duty with regard to imports from that exporter and making imports from that exporter subject to registration*

- *Commission Decision of 29 September 2011 terminating the anti-dumping proceeding concerning imports of certain graphite electrode systems originating in the People's Republic of China*

- *Notice of initiation of an expiry review of the anti-dumping measures applicable to imports of certain plastic sacks and bags originating in the People's Republic of China and Thailand*

Customs Law

- *Regulation (EU) No. 955/2011 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 September 2011 repealing Council Regulation (EC) No. 1541/98 on proof of origin for certain textile products falling within Section XI of the Combined Nomenclature and released for free circulation in the Community and on the conditions for the acceptance of such proof, and amending Council Regulation (EEC) No. 3030/93 on common rules for imports of certain textile products from third countries*

Food and Agricultural Law

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 995/2011 of 6 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 6 October 2011 amending Implementing Decision 2011/402/EU on emergency measures applicable to fenugreek seeds and certain seeds and beans imported from Egypt (notified under document C(2011) 7027)*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 991/2011 of 5 October 2011 amending Annex II to Decision 2007/777/EC and Annex I to Regulation (EC) N. 798/2008 as regards the entries for South Africa in the lists of third countries or parts thereof with respect to highly pathogenic avian influenza*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 978/2011 of 3 October 2011 amending Annexes II and III to Regulation (EC) No. 396/2005 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards maximum residue levels for acetamiprid, biphenyl, captan, chlorantraniliprole, cyflufenamid, cymoxanil, dichlorprop-P, difenoconazole, dimethomorph, dithiocarbamates, epoxiconazole, ethephon, flutriafol, fluxapyroxad, isopyrazam, propamocarb, pyraclostrobin, pyrimethanil and spirotetramat in or on certain products*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 980/2011 of 3 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. 971/2011 of 29 September 2011 fixing the representative prices and additional import duties for certain products in the sugar sector for the 2011/12 marketing year*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 972/2011 of 29 September 2011 fixing the representative prices and additional import duties applicable to molasses in the sugar sector from 1 October 2011*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 967/2011 of 28 September 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. 961/2011 of 27 September 2011 imposing special conditions governing the import of feed and food originating in or consigned from Japan following the accident at the Fukushima nuclear power station and repealing Regulation (EU) No. 297/2011*

- *Republication of an application pursuant to Article 7(5) and 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*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 959/2011 of 26 September 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. 953/2011 of 23 September 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 Decision of 20 September 2011 amending Annex D to Council Directive 88/407/EEC as regards trade within the Union in semen of domestic animals of the bovine species dispatched from the semen collection and storage centres (notified under document C(2011) 6425)*

- *Commission Implementing Decision of 20 September 2011 on imports into the Union of semen of domestic animals of the bovine species (notified under document C(2011) 6426)*

- *Commission Regulation (EU) No. 939/2011 of 23 September 2011 correcting Regulation (EC) No. 617/2008 laying down detailed rules for implementing Regulation (EC) No. 1234/2007 as regards marketing standards for eggs for hatching and farmyard poultry chicks*

Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 981/2011 of 30 September 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Jabłka grójeckie (PGI)]*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 982/2011 of 30 September 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Κατσικάκι Ελασσόνας (Katsikaki Elassonas) (PDO)]*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 983/2011 of 30 September 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Cordero de Extremadura (PGI)]*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 984/2011 of 30 September 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Vinagre del Condado de Huelva (PDO)]*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 985/2011 of 30 September 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Vinagre de Jerez (PDO)]*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 986/2011 of 30 September 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Queso Casín (PDO)]*

- *Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 987/2011 of 30 September 2011 entering a name in the register of protected designations of origin and protected geographical indications [Nanoški sir (PDO)]*

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

- *Publication of an amendment 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*

- *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

- *Information on the conclusion of the Protocol setting out the fishing opportunities and the financial contribution provided for by the Fisheries Partnership Agreement between the European Union and the Democratic Republic of São Tomé and Principe*

- *Council Decision of 17 May 2011 on the signing, on behalf of the European Union, and provisional application of the International Cocoa Agreement 2010*

- *Council Decision of 26 September 2011 amending and extending the period of application of Decision 2007/641/EC on the conclusion of consultations with the Republic of the Fiji Islands under Article 96 of the ACP-EC Partnership Agreement and Article 37 of the Development Cooperation Instrument*

- *Commission Decision of 26 September 2011 on benchmarks to allocate greenhouse gas emission allowances free of charge to aircraft operators pursuant to Article 3e of Directive 2003/87/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council*

Ignacio Carreño, Eugenia Laurenza, Anna Martelloni, Vladimir Talanov and Paolo R. Vergano contributed to this issue.