



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 9.1.2007
SEC(2006) 1804

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

ANNEX TO THE

**ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN
PARLIAMENT**

**ON THIRD COUNTRY ANTI-DUMPING, ANTI-SUBSIDY AND SAFEGUARD
ACTION AGAINST THE COMMUNITY (2005)**

[COM(2006) 873 final]

PART II: ACTIONS BY COUNTRY

1. UNITED STATES

At the end of 2005, the US had a total of 39 trade defence measures in force against imports from the Community. The majority of the measures take the form of anti-dumping duties 27, while 12 are countervailing measures. This compares to the end of 2004 where there were also 39 measures (but comprised of 26 anti dumping measures and 13 countervailing) in force against the EU.

As was the case in 2004, the US did not initiate any new cases concerning imports from the EC during 2005. The US imposed definitive measures in two cases concerning Purified Carboxymethylcellulose from Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands and Chlorinated isocyanurates from Spain. There were a number of sunset reviews initiated in November 2005 on measures concerning steel products, and regular administrative reviews, concerning products such as ball bearings and pasta, continued.

Once again, as was the case in 2004, the main focus vis-à-vis trade defence activity by the US concerned measures subject to WTO dispute settlement proceedings with continued activity on the WTO case on “zeroing”, an implementation panel on privatization and thirdly, a case concerning a UK company Firth Rixson.

1.1. Privatisation – implementation panel

For many years, the US refused to accept that the privatization of a firm at market price eliminates the benefit of any prior subsidies. Since 1999, the EC has pursued two WTO disputes in order to challenge this position. Finally, in November 2003, the US accepted the findings of the panels and Appellate Body and changed its methodology accordingly. However, the EC was not satisfied with the US implementation of the findings and following a request to the WTO a panel on implementation (21.5 panel) against the US was established in September 2004. The panel issued its report in 17 August 2005.

In summary the EC had challenged US implementation of three sunset reviews (from the year 2000), alleging that the DOC had erred in the case of *Corrosion-resistant steel from France* by finding the privatization of Usinor was not at fair market value, and in the cases of *Steel plate from UK and Spain*, by not examining the privatizations of British Steel and Aceralia, and by failing to examine other evidence of subsidization during the sunset reviews. While the EC lost on the French case, we won most of the points concerning the UK and Spanish cases. It was decided not to appeal, preferring to put pressure on the DOC to implement the 21.5 panel’s findings on the last two cases.

DOC began its second implementation (Section 129) process in November 2005 and finished at the end of May 2006. Despite the fact that most of the relevant data concerning the privatizations of British Steel and Aceralia had already been submitted to DOC, they nevertheless issued numerous questionnaires in the context of implementation to the companies concerned as well as to the Commission. The Commission worked closely with the companies and also with the UK and Spanish authorities in order to enable them to file replies in time.

The multiplication of the questionnaires is symptomatic of the US' practice of requiring an unreasonably high degree of detail in AD/CVD matters and leads to significant costs for parties to the proceedings. In this particular instance the Commission accompanied UK and Spanish embassy officials to the DOC in order to raise this matter early in 2006.

Unfortunately, the DOC, at the conclusion of the 2nd Section 129 process, decided that both CVD measures should continue. The EC is awaiting the outcome of further sunset reviews (started in 2005) before considering further action.

1.2. "Zeroing": Laws, regulations and methodology for calculating dumping margins (DS294)

Following unsuccessful attempts to resolve the matter through consultations, in 2004 the EC requested the establishment of a WTO panel to examine the US practice of "zeroing" practice both in original investigations and the yearly reviews of existing AD orders (administrative reviews).

Certain types of zeroing result in inflating, or indeed artificially creating, margins of dumping and in the unwarranted collection of anti-dumping duties. The EC industry is severely affected by this practice: DG Trade had identified 31 cases in which "zeroing" was applied. In many cases, without "zeroing", the dumping margin would have been *de minimis* or even negative and, therefore, no anti-dumping duty would have been imposed or collected. Several hundred million USD in trade volume is involved. Some of the products are major export items and other important products will inevitably be affected in the future if the US is allowed to continue "zeroing". A great deal of work was involved in preparing this case, including a detailed examination of the calculations in every US anti-dumping measure since 1995.

In September 2005, the panel issued its final report whereby it condemned the use of zeroing in original investigations, while coming to the conclusion that such practice was still allowed in the context of reviews. On appeal, the Appellate Body reversed the panel's findings on reviews. In its report of April 2006, the Appellate Body found that zeroing in reviews resulted in collecting duties in excess of the actual margin of dumping of the exporter concerned and violated Article 9.3 Anti-Dumping Agreement. The panel's and Appellate Body's reports were adopted at the Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) meeting of 9 May 2006.

The DSB decision is to be most welcomed since it paves the way for re-establishing a level playing field between the EC and the US anti-dumping systems, in particular in respect of the calculation of the amount of duty to be paid. The United States must now implement the decision by 9 April 2007. The EC will closely monitor the implementation steps as well as the US practice to ensure that it is no longer tainted by the use of zeroing.

1.3. WTO consultations – Firth Rixson case

In *Steel Bar from the UK*, DOC imposed an "adverse facts available" AD duty of 125.77% on the exporter **Firth Rixson** just because the firm was unable to produce detailed production cost data for a small factory which it had acquired in a merger and dismantled before the investigation started. During 2005 the EC held two rounds of WTO consultations with the US on this case but to no avail. In addition there were several bilateral contacts at the highest level on the cases where the EC proposed various settlements in the case, all of which were rejected by the US. It was planned early in 2006 to hold a third round of WTO consultations

on this case. However Firth Rixson requested an administrative review in March 2006 and as a result it has been decided to put any further WTO action on hold pending the outcome of the review. We, along with our US delegation, continue to work closely with Firth Rixson in order to expedite the review to a successful conclusion.

1.4. Anti-Dumping Latvia – Rebar

In September 2005 the DOC released the preliminary findings in the administrative review of the anti-dumping measures imposed on Latvian re-bar in September 2001, increasing the dumping margin from 3.6% to 8.8%. The affected EU producer, Liepajas Metalurgs, participated fully in the review.

Several parts of the preliminary determination were questionable (including “zeroing”) resulting in artificially inflating the dumping margin. We intervened with DOC on certain aspects of the findings. DOC’s final finding of 10 February 2006 gave a better result – 5.24%.

1.5. Sunset reviews – steel measures

On 1 November 2005, the US initiated 2nd sunset reviews of 25 AD/CVD measures which go back to the huge wave of 1993 steel cases. 14 of these concern EC Member States – 9AD and 5 CVD, including the three measures which featured in the 21.5 panel of the DS 212 privatization case (see above). After working closely with the Member States concerned, we obtained full reviews for the measures involving UK, Belgium and Sweden (plate) and France (corrosion-resistant), the final results of which were published in September 2006. For the UK the measures were removed, but they were maintained for the other countries concerned. In the case of Spain (plate), Aceralia did not wish to co-operate, leading to an expedited review and the prolongation of the measure by DOC. In the 9 AD cases, the exporters are putting their efforts into the ITC injury investigation. The ITC has granted a full review in all the sunsets, the outcome of which will be known in December 2006.

1.6. Brass sheet and strip

A further sunset review on CVD measures against *Brass Sheet and Strip from France*, a measure which goes back to 1987, started on 1 April 2005. In this case, we worked closely with the French government and exporter (Tréfinmetaux) and it became clear that the original subsidies no longer had any effect. The likelihood of a positive outcome was strengthened by the DOC decision (following extensive lobbying from our side) to conduct a “full” sunset review, and on 23 February 2006, DOC finally had to revoke the measure.

2. INDIA

For long, the EC strongly criticised India’s anti-dumping practice which it considered in violation of WTO rules. In particular, the injury and causality analysis were of an unacceptably low quality and the initiation standard very low. In addition, India systematically failed to provide meaningful disclosure documents and disregarded comments issued by the EC exporters and the EC. The lack of improvement in India’s anti-dumping practice led, in December 2003, the EC to request WTO consultations with India on 27 of its anti-dumping measures, which the EC considered to be in violation of WTO rules. Several rounds of discussions were held with India in 2004 and India showed willingness to address some of the shortfalls raised by the EC.

The positive outcome of those discussions materialised in 2005. Indeed, at the end of 2005, India had a total of 22 trade defence measures (all but 1 are AD) in force against imports from the Community, which represents an important decrease from the previous year when India had 36 measures in force against the EC. This is mostly the result of reviews upon the request of EC exporters following the above mentioned consultations, resulting in the termination of 10 measures.

A decreasing trend is also to be noted regarding new investigations: India only opened 2 investigations in 2005 compared to 3 in 2004 and 7 in 2003. The sector most affected in 2005 remains the chemical industry, followed by the pharmaceutical sector.

The EC efforts seem to have born fruit in terms of the number of cases. Unfortunately, in terms of quality, problems remain although the Indian Authorities clearly have made some efforts to conduct more thorough investigations. In the latest investigation (EPDM, still ongoing), the EC regretted the weak injury and causality analysis, disrespect of the confidentiality rules leading to partly meaningless disclosures, and disregard of comments submitted by the EC exporters. Therefore the EC continues to closely monitor India's TDI action.

2.1. Appeal cases

During the course of 2005, upon request of the EC exporters, India initiated reviews of a number of measures subject to WTO consultations. Several of these reviews led to a termination of the measures. Unfortunately, during the second half of 2005, the Indian domestic industry appealed a number of the terminations (5 in total). In the case of two of these, Vitamin A Palmitate and Cold Rolled Flat Products of Stainless Steel, the latter being of high economic importance to the EC, the measures were reinstated while waiting for the appeals to come before CESTAT (the Indian appellate tribunal). The EC strongly opposed these developments as European exports were once again subject to high anti-dumping duties which were entirely WTO incompatible. In the beginning of 2006, 2 of the appeals were withdrawn by the domestic industry, leaving 3 cases still under appeal at this stage, including Stainless Steel. As CESTAT is not subject to any deadlines regarding the appeal process it is impossible to say when this matter will be resolved. The EC continues to closely monitor the situation and is in regular contact with the Indian Authorities to try to find a solution.

3. PAKISTAN

Pakistan initiated 3 anti-dumping cases against *inter alia* the EC in 2005, which stands in stark contrast to their traditionally rather modest use of the trade defence instruments heretofore. Until last year, the EC had only been affected once by measures adopted in Pakistan (AD measures concerning Sorbitol originating in France were adopted in 2003). The EC is particularly concerned about low initiation standards and exceptionally low injury and causality analysis. In addition, insufficient disclosures seriously hampered the EC exporters' right to properly defend their interests.

3.1. Anti-dumping investigation on Tinplate

In December 2005, Pakistan initiated an anti-dumping investigation into imports of Tinplate originating, *inter alia* in France, Germany, Italy and the UK on the basis of a complaint lodged by the Pakistani domestic tinplate producers. The EC found the standard of initiation

exceptionally low and the decision to open a case in clear breach of WTO AD rules. It therefore urged Pakistan to terminate the case without delay. While this case was not important in economic terms for the EC exporters, it highlights concerns regarding the low initiation standard and possible spill-over effect on future cases. The main problems related to: unclear definition of the domestic industry, excessive and unjustified amount of confidential information leaving the disclosure meaningless, no supporting evidence, non-injurious situation of the domestic producer and finally no analysis of other factors which could have contributed to the alleged difficulties of the applicant. Finally the Pakistan Authorities closed the case at the beginning of June 2006 on the grounds that the applicant did not suffer injury and that there was no causal link between the increase of imports and the situation of the domestic industry.

3.2. Anti-dumping investigation on Formic Acid

The anti-dumping investigation regarding Formic Acid was initiated in September 2005 against Germany and Finland. In close collaboration with the European exporters concerned, the EC issued submissions both at the preliminary stage of the investigation (when the Pakistan Authorities imposed preliminary measures) and upon receipt of the document on essential facts, on the basis of which a final determination is made. The EC was again concerned by the low standard of the investigation, in particular the remarkably weak injury and causality analyses. In addition, the EC regretted that the Pakistani Authorities did not send individual confidential disclosures to the exporters concerned. The exporters who did not have the possibility to attend a disclosure meeting or to go to Pakistan to collect the disclosed information were therefore faced with a situation where they had no opportunity to properly defend their interests or to correct calculation errors, if any. Unfortunately definitive measures were imposed by Pakistan in July 2006 with duty rates ranging from 6.25% to 13.63% for co-operating EU exporters.

4. RUSSIA AND UKRAINE

Despite relatively few new initiations (Russia 4 SFG cases; Ukraine 1 SFG case), 2005 has been a very active year. The bulk of the work has centred on investigations initiated in 2004 but where the main developments have taken place in the course of 2005. In 2005 Ukraine concluded 3 safeguard investigations on abrasive instruments, cast iron parts for pumps and material for roofing. While measures were applied in all three cases, their impact on EC exports was not substantial. In the case of roofing material, the products exported by the EC were excluded from the scope of the measures, whereas in the case of abrasive instruments, the price of EC exports was above the minimum price established in the definitive measures.

There are however 3 investigations (see below) which have, in particular, tied up very significant resources in 2005, namely the anti-dumping investigation by Russia on imports of stainless steel from the EU, the safeguard investigation by Russia on imports of lamps and the anti-dumping investigation by Ukraine on imports of screw compressors from Belgium, Finland and Italy. The most controversial have been the two anti-dumping investigations which have been characterised by lack of transparency and insufficient disclosure of information by the investigating authorities. The Commission has intervened at all levels with the authorities to improve the situation and to secure the best possible outcome for EC exporters. The Commission has held several rounds of meetings in Russia and in Ukraine with the competent authorities to discuss the problematic issues.

In general, these cases have caused significant preoccupation amongst EC exporters which have voiced concern that trade defence measures are used to promote national industries. EC Member States, in particular Poland and the Baltic States, have on several occasions raised the issue as to the respect of international trade rules by these countries, especially in view of their possible entry to the WTO.

4.1. Anti-dumping investigation into stainless steel

In 2005, Russia continued its anti-dumping investigation into stainless steel from the EC, initiated in 2004. This involved 26 product groups for which EC exports to Russia amount to around 75 MEUR/year.

The case has been very controversial throughout, as the Commission contested from the start the factual basis upon which the dumping claim was made. The Commission argued that the case was based on inaccurate data, mainly concerning the price at which EC goods were allegedly exported to Russia. The Commission tried at every level and by all means to convince the Russian authorities of the absence of justification for this case, and made repeated interventions at technical and political levels to this end. The Commission services worked in close collaboration with the European industry to pursue the case.

In November 2005 the Russian authorities concluded their investigation and presented their findings, which appeared to perpetuate all the erroneous data initially introduced by the complainant. This sustained concerns that they could apply an anti-dumping measure of an inordinately high level. The Commission reacted without delay and sought meetings with the Russian authorities to find a mutually satisfactory outcome. At the time of writing, indications are that the Russians may refrain from imposing measures.

4.2. Safeguard investigation into electric lamps

Russia initiated the safeguard investigation into electric lamps on 14 September 2004. Yearly EC exports to Russia for this product amount to approximately €10 million.

The Commission has since the initiation continuously sought to get the investigation terminated. The Russian authorities had in 2004 opened the case despite the fact that the increase in imports was attributable entirely to Kyrgyzstan which as a member of the CIS enjoys privileged access to the Russian market. The increase in imports was therefore also foreseeable. Under these circumstances, the Commission urged Russia to seek a solution at bilateral level with Kyrgyzstan instead of penalizing other exporters including the EC. Despite the debatable grounds for initiation, the authorities considered that the investigation had to be continued since additional evidence had appeared after the initiation that China, as of 2004, had started a very brisk export activity to Russia. However, the injury allegedly suffered by the domestic producers seemed predominantly self-inflicted. The expanding Russian market evidently attracted an increasing inflow of lamps from all origins while the domestic industry, largely outdated, was unable to face the growing competition from higher quality imported lamps and suffered lower sales. In 2005, the Commission stepped up its efforts to press the Russian authorities to find an acceptable alternative to an erga omnes safeguard measure. The EC met with the Russian investigating authorities at the end of 2005. As a minimum, the EC pushed for the exclusion of types of lamps of the decorative kind which are not manufactured by the complainant and therefore not the cause of the alleged injury to the Russian lamps producers.

Despite convincing elements supporting this view, the Russian authorities refused any form of product exclusion and in January 2006 imposed definitive measures in the form of a quota. The quantity allocated to the EU suppliers is 31.5 million pieces/year. The Commission has nevertheless the intention to continue efforts to exclude some European lamp types from the measure.

4.3. Three safeguard investigations into chemicals

On 27 October 2005 Russia initiated three safeguard cases simultaneously concerning chemicals products; sulfurous anhydride, sodium cyanide and ammonium chloride. The investigation regarding sulfurous anhydride was of particular concern given a significant level of exports from Finland to Russia of that product.

The Commission had serious concerns regarding the initiation of these three cases as the information available clearly indicated that the main petitioner in all three cases had obviously suffered serious financial problems between 2002/2003. This resulted in an almost complete cessation of production by the petitioner hence creating a serious shortage of the products concerned in the Russian market. This demand was met by an increase in imports. More recently the petitioner, who recommenced activities, had started to re-supply the Russian market once again. These three cases are classic examples of poor standards of initiation where an obvious ‘other factor’ has been blatantly ignored and an investigation initiated needlessly. The Commission intervened immediately after initiation highlighting the flaws of the case, assisting the Finnish exporter in defending the case as well as attending and presenting submissions at the public hearings held in March 2006. The Commission was pleased to note that in August 2006, the Russian authorities closed the case for precisely the reasons argued by the Commission in its submissions.

4.4. Ukraine: Anti-dumping investigation into screw compressors

Ukraine initiated this investigation in November 2004 against Belgium, Italy, Finland and Belarus which was controversial from the outset. The Commission strongly objected to the complaint lodged by the Ukrainian producer, as it did not contain proper evidence on dumping, and indicated to the Ukrainian authorities that the opening of the investigation in these circumstances was inconsistent with the rules prevailing at international level.

Throughout the proceeding, the Commission identified many procedural shortcomings of the investigations, which it raised at every level with the Ukrainian authorities. In March 2005 Ukraine imposed provisional anti-dumping duties ranging between 50% and 60%. The Commission sought consultations with the Ukrainian authorities during which it protested at the measure and the way the investigation had been conducted, and asked the Ukrainian authorities to review their decision.

Ukraine disclosed the definitive findings of the investigation in July 2005 and proposed definitive anti-dumping duties at an even higher level than the provisional ones (up to 75%). The Commission contested both the findings and the measure proposed: domestic and imported screw compressors had not been adequately compared, as they varied greatly in specifications and price; information provided by some EC exporters had been ignored. Concerning the measure, the Ukrainian authorities had failed to apply the so called “lesser duty rule” required by the Ukrainian legislation: they did not calculate which level of duty would be necessary to remove the injury suffered by the domestic producer, which by virtue

of Ukrainian law would have been the one applicable in the event that it was lower than the dumping margin.

Following the protest of the Commission the Ukrainian authorities revised their definitive findings applying the “lesser duty rule” and introduced on 17 October 2005 an anti-dumping duty of 29% against all countries involved. The Commission found this level of duty still excessive and disproportionate to the moderate losses of the domestic industry, and continued discussions in 2006 with a view to alleviating the impact of this measure on EC exporters.

5. CHINA

During 2005 China became very active in the field of anti-dumping and, in fact, in the latter half of the year initiated the highest number of cases among WTO members. Fortunately only 3 of these cases concerned imports from the EC. Nevertheless the Commission continues to follow all Chinese trade defence cases closely in order to ensure that they meet the relevant WTO rules and that any problems/shortcomings in their practice do not become systemic.

There were no safeguard or anti-subsidy investigations initiated by China during 2005.

At the end of 2005, a total of 9 definitive anti-dumping measures were in force against imports from the Community compared to 7 at the end of 2004. All of these measures concern chemical products. There were no safeguard or CVD measures in place on imports from the EC.

In last year’s report China was referred to as a relatively ‘new’ user of the trade defence instruments. However as time passes, and given their increasing use of the anti-dumping instrument in particular, it should be expected that their standards improve and are fully in conformity with the WTO Agreement. Unfortunately this is not evident and the most notable and serious problem faced by EU exporters is the lack of transparency and poor disclosure, not to mention poor injury/causation analysis in investigations. Given the importance of these particular aspects in any anti-dumping proceeding, the Commission has continued to press China to improve their practice and works with EC industry to identify the ongoing problems. As well as raising our concerns with the Chinese authorities in various bilateral meetings e.g. Economic and Trade Working Group the Commission also continues to provide technical assistance to China in order to help further improve the standards applied by them in conducting investigations. Two seminars were held in 2005, one for officials of the Chinese Investigation Bureau of Industry Injury (October 2005), which was particularly important given their poor track record on this aspect while the other was a general seminar on TDI practice (November 2005).

5.1. Chloroform: Imposition of definitive duties

China had initiated on 30 May 2003 an anti-dumping investigation on imports of Chloroform originating, *inter alia*, in EC, South Korea, the USA and India. The Commission followed the matter with the EC industries concerned which had co-operated in the case. In April 2004 provisional anti-dumping duties were imposed by the Chinese Ministry of Commerce at rates ranging from 16% to 59%. In November 2004 definitive anti-dumping measures were imposed at rates ranging from 32% to 96%. Undertakings were accepted from certain EC companies who had cooperated in the proceeding.

5.2. Hydrazine Hydrate: Imposition of definitive duties

China had initiated an anti-dumping investigation on imports of Hydrazine Hydrate originating, *inter alia*, in France, the USA, Japan and South Korea in December 2003. The Commission followed the matter with the EC industries concerned which had co-operated in the case. On 17 June 2005, definitive anti-dumping duties were imposed the Chinese Ministry of Commerce on imports originating in France, ranging from 68% to 184%.

5.3. Chloroprene Rubber: Imposition of definitive measures

China had initiated an anti-dumping investigation on imports of Chloroprene rubber originating in the EU, the USA and Japan in November 2003. The Commission followed the matter with the EC industries concerned. On 10 May 2005, definitive anti-dumping duties were imposed the Chinese Ministry of Commerce on imports originating in the EC, ranging from 11 to 151%.

5.4. Outcome of interim review on Catechol from the Community

On 27 August 2003, China imposed definitive anti-dumping measures on imports of Catechol from the Community. On 10 December 2004, China initiated an interim review on these measures, based on a request from the original complainant claiming that the dumping margin imposed was no longer sufficient as the levels of dumping had increased. The period of review was 1 September 2003 to 31 August 2004. The review was finalised in October 2005 and resulted in an increase in the margins for two European exporters, with the residual duty remaining unchanged. Provisional measures were imposed by China in December 2005 on the same product coming from US and Japan suggesting that the sole producer of catechol in China is using the anti-dumping instrument aggressively to protect against competition.

This was the first interim review initiated by China on the basis of a request from the domestic industry and given that it resulted in higher dumping margins may prompt other Chinese industries to follow suit. The Commission is monitoring this issue.

5.5. New investigations opened

Three new anti-dumping investigations were initiated by China in 2005 concerning imports from the EC. Two of the products concerned were chemicals; Octanol (September 2005) and Butanol (October 2005) and the third was Wear resistant overlay (June 2005).

The Commission informed the relevant industries concerned and offered assistance and advice during the proceedings. In June 2006 provisional measures were imposed on wear resistant overlay. No measures have been imposed in the other two cases and the Commission continues to monitor the cases to ensure that they are carried out in accordance with WTO rules.

6. MOROCCO

6.1. Safeguard investigation – ceramic tiles

Morocco initiated a safeguard investigation into ceramic tiles on 24 January 2005. The case prompted a reaction from both the Commission and EC industry, since the Community, in

particular Spain, has been a traditional supplier to the Moroccan market, with exports of more than 70 mio Euro per year.

The Commission took an active part in the investigation and participated at each step of the proceedings, right from the hearing that took place in Ankara in March 2005.

The Moroccan authorities disclosed their findings in August 2005. They concluded that increased imports had caused injury to the Moroccan producers and proposed the imposition of a safeguard measure of 1.5 dirhams/kg for duration of 4 years. This level of duty was clearly prohibitive for EC exporters.

The European Commission examined the findings in detail and presented its comments in writing to Morocco. The Commission also requested consultations in the context of the Safeguards Agreement and subsequently held extensive discussions with the Moroccan authorities. The Commission identified several weaknesses in the findings and expressed the view that the measures proposed were beyond any reasonable remedy to the difficulties encountered by the domestic industry.

Following these discussions, the Moroccan authorities decided to introduce a tariff quota in January 2006 for 3 years, above which the duty of 1.5 dirhams/kg would be applicable. The quantity allocated to the EC was 6 million m²/year and corresponded to the EC's traditional level of exports to Morocco. A 10% increase in this quantity would be applied for each subsequent year. EC exporters expressed satisfaction at this outcome.

7. TURKEY

In 2005, Turkey carried out 5 investigations initiated in July 2004 into the following products: activated earth and clays, glassware, glass mirrors, thermometers, volt- and am-meters. The Commission had registered as an interested party and played an active part in these proceedings.

7.1. Safeguard investigations – glassware, glass mirrors and thermometers

The investigation into glassware was terminated in January 2005, following the withdrawal of the complaint by the Turkish industry, while in two further cases – glass mirrors and thermometers – the Turkish authorities did not find a clear causal link between imports and injury, and accordingly terminated the investigations in March 2005 without imposing measures.

7.2. Safeguard measures – activated earths and clays

Concerning activated earth and clays, Turkey introduced a safeguard measure in the form of a quota on 8 July 2005 applicable for 3 years. The measure is applied only to imports under 0.31 USD/kg and has therefore no impact on EC exports, which are well above this price level.

7.3. Safeguard measures – voltmeters and ammeters

In the case of voltmeters and ammeters, Turkey introduced on 12 August 2005 a safeguard measure in the form of a quota applicable for 3 years. A large part of EC exports is not

concerned by the measures, as imports over 80 \$/kg and shipments less than 50 kg are exempt.

8. LATIN AMERICA

During 2005, there was only one anti-dumping investigation opened by Brazil but was concluded without the imposition of measures. In terms of new measures, Mexico imposed one definitive countervailing duty. There were, however, some developments concerning existing cases. Two safeguard measures were extended (Brazil/toys and Chile/wheat flour) and Mexico decided on the continuation of two countervailing duties (beef and starch). There were also two reviews initiated, one by Brazil and another by Mexico. Brazil suspended the anti-dumping measures applied on insulin products and Peru terminated the safeguard investigation on textiles without definitive measures. Some other measures were also terminated as a result their natural expiry or following an expiry review (i.e. Brazil: anti-dumping measures on hydroxyethyl cellulose; Ecuador: safeguard measures on ceramic tiles and on fibreboard; Mexico: anti-dumping measures on crystal polystyrene). Monitoring of Argentinean cases was characterised by recourse to WTO consultations regarding two CVD measures concerning imports from the EC.

8.1. Mexico: definitive countervailing duties on olive oil

Mexico had initiated, in July 2003, a countervailing duty investigation on imports of olive oil originated in the EC. The exporting Member States most affected are Italy and Spain (with €18.5 million exports in 2002). In June 2004, Mexico imposed a provisional countervailing duty which was in force for four months, the maximum period allowed under WTO rules. The decision on definitive findings was due by mid-January 2005 but the Mexican authorities have continuously postponed it and carried on with the investigation.

The Commission has been very involved in this case and used all possible means throughout the investigation to highlight and protest against the deficiencies in this proceeding. The defence was thoroughly prepared in cooperation with the Member States and industry concerned, which provided important contributions for developing and substantiating EC arguments.

The investigating authority is targeting an aid that does not confer a direct benefit to the olive oil producers concerned by this investigation. This would normally require Mexico to demonstrate how a benefit to olive growers actually passes through to EC exporters of olive oil to Mexico. The Mexican authorities have failed to do so which, in the Commission's view, is not in compliance with the WTO requirements.

The Commission has also strongly argued that the cessation of activity of the domestic industry, which took place well before the initiation of this case, was not caused by alleged subsidized imports but by other known factors (loss of distribution network and right to use established brand name) that the authorities failed to take into consideration.

Despite numerous EC submissions and vigorous protests during the investigation, Mexico decided to impose definitive countervailing duties on EC imports of olive oil. As a result, the Commissions requested WTO DSU consultations on the case. These were held in May 2006 but no satisfactory solution was found. Further steps are being considered.

8.2. Mexico: Extension of the countervailing duties on bovine meat

On 3 June 2004, Mexico initiated an expiry review of the countervailing measures imposed on imports of bovine meat from the EC. The Commission followed the matter and participated in the proceeding submitting information which supported the argument that the aid targeted in the initial investigation (1994) is no longer in force. Nevertheless, on 29 June 2005, the countervailing measures were extended for another five years.

8.3. Chile: review of the safeguard measures on wheat flour

The case was opened on 10 December 2004 and a provisional duty of 17% applied immediately. The Commission participated in the proceeding with the EC industry concerned. On 4 March 2005, Chile imposed definitive safeguard measures (17% *ad valorem*) exempting the wheat flour with specific physicochemical characteristics and a CIF price above US\$ 0,3/Kilo Net. According to the EC exporter, this is precisely the flour EC is exporting to Chile and as a result our exports are not affected by the measure.

On 10 December 2005, further to an expiry review (measures taken for only one year), the definitive measures were extended for an additional period on one year (they were liberalised: 14% *ad valorem*). The extended measure also encompasses the exception, which permits EC exports not to be targeted.

8.4. Argentina: Countervailing duties on wheat gluten- request for WTO consultations

On 20 August 2004, following an expiry review initiated in 2003, Argentina extended the measures on imports of wheat gluten from the EC for another three years while at the same time increasing the level of duty to US\$ 204.74/tonne (US\$123,30/tonne). Already at the time of the original imposition (1998) as well as during the latest expiry review, the EC had vigorously contested the legality of the CVD measures since the product in question does not, directly or indirectly, benefit from any subsidies. The subsidies countervailed by Argentina are granted to co- or by-products of wheat gluten (e.g. starch, glucose). Despite this, Argentina has, without any supporting analysis, assumed that the subsidies in question are fully transferable to EC exports of wheat gluten.

The Commission has also strongly argued that the devaluation of the Argentinean peso in 2002 no longer justifies maintaining the CVD measures as imports from the EC tripled in price, rebutting any threat of injury from EC imports.

In view of these developments in May 2005 the EC requested WTO consultations with Argentina, which took place in Geneva in July 2005. The consultations confirmed the EC's view that Argentina had not done any proper 'pass through' or injury analysis. The EC has since been preparing for an eventual WTO panel.

8.5. Argentina: Countervailing duties on olive oil – Request for WTO consultations

In December 2004, following a sunset review, Argentina extended the existing CVD measures, already in force since 1998, on imports of olive oil for an additional three year period. The duties imposed are US\$1,0/kg on packed olive oil and US\$0.80/kg on olive oil in bulk.

The issue at stake here is similar to that for the wheat gluten case. The investigating authorities have targeted an aid scheme (production aid to olive growers), which does not grant a direct benefit to the product concerned by this investigation, namely olive oil. This lack of direct link between the aid scheme and the product concerned requires that the analysis demonstrate how the benefit passes through to olive oil producers. The Argentinean authorities have consistently failed to do so. The Commission considers this to be a clear breach of the requirements of the WTO SCM Agreement.

The Commission has also objected to the fact that Argentina, by initiating this sunset review *ex officio*, has not respected the *peace clause*. The devaluation of the peso has also rendered the imports of olive oil from the EC much more expensive, thereby questioning the necessity to maintain the measures.

Following the extension of the measures in December 2004, the EC decided to bring the matter before the WTO and requested WTO consultations with Argentina. These were held in Geneva in July 2005, but did not bring the parties any closer to a mutually satisfactory solution. In the meantime the EC continued its preparations for a WTO panel.

However this is now no longer relevant given that Argentina terminated the measures on 31 July 2006.

9. AUSTRALIA

Australia is one of the “old” users of trade defence instruments and has often targeted Community agricultural aid schemes. However, the number of Australian trade defence cases against the Community has steadily declined in recent years. At the end of 2005, Australia had a total of 6 trade defence measures in force against imports from the Community compared to 8 the previous year. 4 of these take the form of anti-dumping duties, while the remaining 2 are countervailing measures. During 2005, Australia initiated no new investigation concerning imports from the EC. They completed a review of measures on PVC from Hungary and the measures will be kept in place. They also terminated the CVD measures on bulk brandy after a sunset review.

9.1. Sunset review on bulk brandy from France – Termination of countervailing measures

On 27 February 2005, Australia terminated the countervailing measures on bulk brandy from France, following a sunset review. These measures had been in force since February 1990. Australia found that imports from France were still subsidized, and that injury was still present, but decided that there was no causal link between the French imports and the injury.

On 13 August 2004, the Australian Customs Service (ACS) initiated a sunset review of these countervailing measures.

The Commission services have, during the inquiry, been in close contact with the French authorities and the Federation des Exportateurs de Vins et Spiriteux de France (FEVS), who represent the interest of French brandy exporters. The Commission services have made several submissions to the ACS.

The ACS was not able to link the injury being suffered by the Australian bulk brandy industry to imported subsidised French bulk brandy. In fact, the ACS was satisfied that it was the

presence of substantial volumes of lower-priced local production in the marketplace, rather than imported bulk brandy, that created the major price pressure faced by the Australian bulk brandy industry.

Against this background, the ACS considered that the removal of the countervailing measures on imported French bulk brandy would be unlikely to lead to a recurrence of material injury.

MEASURES IN FORCE AT THE END OF 2003, 2004 AND 2005												
Country	AD			CVD			SG			TOTAL		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
ANDEAN COMMUNITY	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
ARGENTINA	4	6	3	3	3	3	2	0	0	9	9	6
AUSTRALIA	4	5	4	3	3	2	0	0	0	7	8	6
BRAZIL	10	12	8	0	0	0	2	1	2	12	13	10
BULGARIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	2	2	1
CANADA	8	9	7	2	3	1	0	0	0	10	12	8
CHILE	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
CHINA	4	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	9
COLOMBIA	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
ECUADOR	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	1
EGYPT	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	4
INDIA	29	34	21	0	0	0	3	2	1	32	36	22
INDONESIA	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2
ISRAEL	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
JORDAN	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	4	4	3
KOREA	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	2	1
MALAYSIA	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
MEXICO	4	4	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	6	5
MOLDOVA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1
MOROCCO	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
NEW ZEALAND	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	2
PAKISTAN	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
PERU	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	1
PHILIPPINES	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	1	4	4
RUSSIA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	2	4	2	2
SOUTH AFRICA	11	10	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	6
TAIPEI	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
THAILAND	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2
TURKEY	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	3
UKRAINE	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	3	5	1	3	6
USA ¹	29	26	27	15	13	12	0	0	0	44	39	39
VENEZUELA	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	1	1	3	3
TOTAL	117	132	103	27	29	24	22	24	24	166	185	151

¹ For the US, the total number of measures in force have been revised for 2003 and 2004 to ensure consistency in the manner in which measures are counted.

Investigations opened in 2003, 2004 and 2005												
Country	AD			CVD			SG			TOTAL		
	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005	2003	2004	2005
Andean Community	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Argentina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Australia	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
Bosnia Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Brazil	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Bulgaria	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0
Byelorussia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0
Canada	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	2
Chile	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
China	4	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3
Colombia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Croatia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Ecuador	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4	0	0
Egypt	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
India	7	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	7	3	2
Indonesia	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1
Jordan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Korea	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Mexico	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Moldova	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Morocco	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
New Zealand	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Pakistan	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Peru	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Philippines	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	0	0
Russia	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	3	4
South Africa	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Thailand	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	5	0
Ukraine	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	1
USA	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0
Venezuela	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
TOTAL	19	13	9	3	1	0	8	19	11	30	33	20

Investigations opened in 2005				
Country	Product	Type	Initiation Date	Country investigated
Brazil	Polycarbonate resins	AD	2005-Aug-09	Belgium, Germany, Spain, Italy, Netherlands
Canada	Tobacco	SG	2005-Dec-29	European Union of 25
Canada	Bicycles	SG	2005-Feb-10	European Union of 25
China	Butanol	AD	2005-Oct-14	European Union of 25
China	Wear resistant overlay	AD	2005-Jun-13	European Union of 25
China	Octanol	AD	2005-Sep-15	European Union of 25
Croatia	Fresh bovine meat	SG	2005-Jun-20	European Union of 25
India	Ethylene-Propylene-non-Conjugated Diene Rubber (EPDM)	AD	2005-Apr-28	Belgium, Germany, Spain, Netherlands, United Kingdom
India	Pentaerythritol	AD	2005-Feb-04	Sweden
Indonesia	Cigarette lighters and other lighters	SG	2005-Jul-28	European Union of 25
Jordan	Pesticides/insecticides	SG	2005-Jan-01	European Union of 25
Morocco	Ceramic tiles	SG	2005-Jan-24	European Union of 25
Pakistan	Formic acid	AD	2005-Sep-08	Germany, Finland
Pakistan	Footwear	AD	2005-Jul-10	European Union of 25
Pakistan	Tinplate of thickness of less than 0,5mm and of width of 600mm or more	AD	2005-Dec-06	Germany, France, Italy, UK
Russia	Ammonium chloride	SG	2005-Oct-27	European Union of 25
Russia	Sodium cyanide	SG	2005-Oct-27	European Union of 25
Russia	Sulfurous anhydride	SG	2005-Oct-27	European Union of 25
Russia	Steel pipes (for oil and gas industry)	SG	2005-Jan-28	European Union of 25
Ukraine	Carboxymethylcellulose	SG	2005-Aug-18	European Union of 25

Measures imposed in 2005					
Country	Product	Type	Type Of Measure	Date Of Imposition	Exporting MS
Canada	Laminate flooring	AD	Definitive	2005-May-17	France
Chile	Wheat flour	SG	Definitive	2005-Mar-04	Spain
China	Benzofuranol; (7-Hydroxy or Furan phenol)	AD	Provisional	2005-Jun-16	Italy
China	Dimethyl Cyclosiloxane	AD	Provisional	2005-Sep-29	Germany, United Kingdom
China	Chloroprene Rubber	AD	Definitive	2005-May-10	Germany, France, European Union of 15
China	Hydrazine Hydrate	AD	Definitive	2005-Jun-17	France
China	Ethylene-Propylene-non-Conjugated Diene Rubber (EPDR)	AD	Provisional	2005-Nov-16	Netherlands
India	Acrylonitrile butadiene rubber (NBR)	AD	Definitive	2005-Jun-07	Belgium, France
India	Certain Rubber Chemicals	AD	Definitive	2005-Aug-16	Belgium, Germany, Italy
India	Pentaerythritol	AD	Provisional	2005-Aug-05	Sweden
India	Starch from tapioca (manioc)	SG	Definitive	2005-May-02	European Union of 25
India	Mica pearl pigment	AD	Definitive	2005-Mar-21	Germany
Jordan	Pesticides/insecticides	SG	Definitive	2005-Oct-16	European Union of 25
Mexico	Olive oil	CVD	Definitive	2005-Aug-02	Spain, Italy
Moldova	Cosmetics (Toilet waters - Shampoos)	SG	Provisional	2005-Jan-01	European Union of 25
Russia	Dry yeast (bakery)	SG	Definitive	2005-Mar-15	European Union of 15
South Africa	Cheddar cheese	AD	Definitive	2005-Feb-11	Ireland
Turkey	Voltmeters and Ammeters	SG	Definitive	2005-Aug-12	Germany, Spain, Italy, United Kingdom
Turkey	Activated earth and clays	SG	Definitive	2005-Jul-08	Germany, Greece, France, United Kingdom
Ukraine	Abrasive instruments	SG	Definitive	2005-Feb-01	European Union of 15

Ukraine	Cast iron parts for pumps	SG	Definitive	2005-Feb-18	European Union of 15
Ukraine	Rolled and waterproofing material	SG	Definitive	2005-Aug-18	European Union of 25
Ukraine	Screw compressor installations	AD	Definitive	2005-Oct-17	Belgium, Italy, Finland
United States	Chlorinated isocyanurates	AD	Definitive	2005-Jun-24	Spain
United States	Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	AD	Definitive	2005-May-10	Netherlands Sweden, Finland

ALL MEASURES IN FORCE ON 31 DECEMBER 2005 (DEFINITIVE AND PROVISIONAL)

Country	Product	Type	Case Status	Date Of Imposition	Exporting MS
Andean Community	Sorbitol	AD	Definitive	2003-May-15	France
Argentina	Calcium carbide	AD	Definitive	2001-Nov-21	Poland
Argentina	Hot-rolled steel (HRS)	AD	Definitive	2002-Apr-30	Slovakia
Argentina	Olive oil	CVD	Definitive	1998-Jun-25	Greece, Spain, Italy
Argentina	Peaches, preserved in water containing added sweetening matter, including syrup, preserved in any other form or in water	CVD	Definitive	1996-Jan-10	Greece
Argentina	Steel disc for agricultural machines	AD	Definitive	2001-Jul-30	Spain
Argentina	Vital wheat gluten	CVD	Definitive	1998-Jul-22	European Union of 15
Australia	Air conditioners, split system caravan	AD	Definitive	2001-Apr-21	Italy
Australia	Brandy, bottled	CVD	Definitive	2001-Jun-28	France
Australia	Canned peaches	CVD	Definitive	1992-Feb-19	Greece
Australia	Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid (2,4-D)	AD	Definitive	2003-Mar-24	United Kingdom
Australia	Polyethylene high density	AD	Definitive	2003-Dec-05	Sweden
Australia	Polyvinyl chloride homopolymer resin (PVC)	AD	Definitive	2000-Mar-24	Hungary
Brazil	Coconuts	SG	Definitive	2002-Sep-01	European Union of 15
Brazil	Cold-rolled flat stainless steel	AD	Definitive	2000-May-26	Spain, France
Brazil	Horse nail or horse shoe nail	AD	Definitive	2004-Jun-03	Finland
Brazil	Insulin Products	AD	Definitive	2001-Feb-12	Denmark, France
Brazil	Milk powder	AD	Definitive	2001-Feb-23	Denmark, Ireland
Brazil	Méthyl métacrylate	AD	Definitive	2001-Mar-14	Germany, Spain, France, United Kingdom
Brazil	Phenol	AD	Definitive	2002-Oct-16	Belgium, Germany
Brazil	Sodium Tripoliphosphate (STPP)	AD	Definitive	1997-Aug-05	United Kingdom
Brazil	Steel blade (for stone cutting)	AD	Definitive	2003-Oct-13	Italy
Brazil	Toys	SG	Definitive	1997-Jan-01	Italy
Bulgaria	Crown corks	SG	Definitive	2002-Nov-29	Germany, Greece, Italy, United Kingdom
Canada	Concrete reinforcing bar	AD	Definitive	2001-Jun-01	Latvia, Poland
Canada	Filter tipped cigarette tubes	AD	Definitive	1999-Apr-12	Germany, France

Canada	Hot-rolled carbon steel plate	AD	Definitive	2004-Jan-09	Czech Republic
Canada	Laminate flooring	AD	Definitive	2005-May-17	France
Canada	Refined sugar	AD	Definitive	1995-Nov-06	Denmark, Germany, Netherlands, United Kingdom
Canada	Refined sugar	CVD	Definitive	1995-Nov-06	European Union of 15
Canada	Reinforcing bar (steel)	AD	Definitive	2001-Jun-01	Latvia, Poland
Canada	Stainless Steel round bar	AD	Definitive	1998-Sep-04	Germany, Spain, France, Italy, Sweden, United Kingdom
Chile	Wheat flour	SG	Definitive	2005-Mar-04	Spain
China	Benzofuranol; (7-Hydroxy or Furan phenol)	AD	Provisional	2005-Jun-16	Italy
China	Caprolactam	AD	Definitive	2003-Jun-06	Belgium, Germany, Netherlands
China	Catechol	AD	Definitive	2003-Aug-27	France, Italy
China	Chloroform - Trichloromethane	AD	Definitive	2004-Nov-30	Germany, France, United Kingdom
China	Chloroprene Rubber	AD	Definitive	2005-May-10	Germany, France, European Union of 15
China	Dimethyl Cyclosiloxane	AD	Provisional	2005-Sep-29	Germany, United Kingdom
China	Ethylene-Propylene-non-Conjugated Diene Rubber (EPDR)	AD	Provisional	2005-Nov-16	Netherlands
China	Hydrazine Hydrate	AD	Definitive	2005-Jun-17	France
China	Methylene Chloride	AD	Definitive	2002-Jun-20	Germany, Netherlands, United Kingdom
Egypt	Common electric filament lamps from 25-200 watts - voltage up to 240 watts	AD	Definitive	2002-Sep-05	Spain, Italy, Hungary
Egypt	Steel reinforcing bars	AD	Definitive	1998-Jun-22	Latvia
Egypt	Tyres for motor cars	AD	Definitive	1999-Oct-04	France

Egypt	Tyres for motor cars	AD	Definitive	1999-Oct-04	Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom
India	Acrylonitrile butadiene rubber (NBR)	AD	Definitive	1997-Jul-30	Germany
India	Acrylonitrile butadiene rubber (NBR)	AD	Definitive	2005-Jun-07	Belgium, France
India	Bisphenol A (BPA)	AD	Definitive	2001-Dec-06	European Union of 15
India	Caprolactam (6-Hexanelactum)	AD	Definitive	2004-Sep-16	Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Greece, Spain, France, Ireland, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom
India	Caustic soda	AD	Definitive	2003-Oct-01	Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Estonia, Greece, Spain, Ireland, Italy, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Hungary, Malta, Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom
India	Certain Rubber Chemicals	AD	Definitive	2005-Aug-16	Belgium, Germany, Italy

India	Choline chloride	AD	Definitive	2002-Jan-14	European Union of 15
India	Flexible slabstock polyol (molecular weight 3000-4000)	AD	Definitive	2002-Oct-31	Spain
India	Graphite Electrodes	AD	Definitive	2003-Jan-01	Poland
India	High styrene butadiene copolymer / High styrene resin/rubber (HSR)	AD	Definitive	2001-Dec-18	European Union of 15
India	Mica pearl pigment	AD	Definitive	2005-Mar-21	Germany
India	Oxo Alcohols	AD	Definitive	2000-Aug-18	Belgium, France, European Union of 15
India	PVC paste resin	AD	Definitive	2004-Oct-07	Spain, Italy
India	Pentaerythritol	AD	Provisional	2005-Aug-05	Sweden
India	Phenol	AD	Definitive	2003-Mar-24	European Union of 15
India	Potassium carbonate	AD	Definitive	2004-Feb-16	European Union of 15
India	Propylene glycol	AD	Definitive	2004-Aug-20	Spain
India	Sodium Ferro Cyanide	AD	Definitive	1996-Dec-20	European Union of 15
India	Sodium hydrosulphite	AD	Definitive	2003-Dec-03	Germany
India	Sodium nitrite	AD	Definitive	2002-Nov-29	European Union of 15
India	Starch from tapioca (manioc)	SG	Definitive	2005-May-02	European Union of 25
India	Theophylline & Caffeine	AD	Definitive	2001-Jul-30	European Union of 15
Indonesia	Sorbitol	AD	Definitive	2001-Mar-12	European Union of 15
Indonesia	Uncoated writing and printing paper	AD	Definitive	2004-Nov-11	Finland
Jordan	Ceramic sanitary ware	SG	Definitive	2003-Feb-18	Spain, France, Italy
Jordan	Pasta	SG	Definitive	2003-Feb-25	Italy
Jordan	Pesticides/insecticides	SG	Definitive	2005-Oct-16	European Union of 25
Korea	Stainless steel bar	AD	Definitive	2004-Jul-30	Spain
Malaysia	Self copy paper in rolls and sheets	AD	Definitive	1997-Apr-20	European Union of 15
Mexico	Bovine Meat	CVD	Definitive	1994-Jun-03	Denmark
Mexico	Non-pregelatinized modified cationic potato starch	AD	Definitive	1992-May-25	Netherlands
Mexico	Olive oil	CVD	Definitive	2005-Aug-02	Spain, Italy
Mexico	Parathion Methyl	AD	Definitive	2000-May-31	Denmark
Mexico	Sorbitol UPS grade	AD	Definitive	1990-Sep-27	France

Moldova	Sugar	SG	Definitive	2004-Jan-01	European Union of 15
New Zealand	Canned peaches	AD	Definitive	1998-Mar-09	Greece
New Zealand	Canned peaches	CVD	Definitive	1998-Jan-09	European Union of 15
Pakistan	Sorbitol 70% solution	AD	Definitive	2003-Nov-19	France
Peru	Olive oil	CVD	Definitive	2003-May-25	Czech Republic, Greece, Italy
Philippines	Ceramic floor and wall tiles	SG	Definitive	2002-Apr-11	European Union of 15
Philippines	Figured glass	SG	Definitive	2003-Oct-13	European Union of 15
Philippines	Float glass / Tinted Float glass	SG	Definitive	2003-Oct-13	European Union of 15
Philippines	Glass Mirors	SG	Definitive	2003-Oct-13	European Union of 15
Russia	Ball bearings and other taper roller bearings	SG	Definitive	2003-Jul-25	Germany, Finland
Russia	Dry yeast (bakery)	SG	Definitive	2005-Mar-15	European Union of 15
South Africa	Acetaminophenol	AD	Definitive	1999-Jun-18	France
South Africa	Circuit breakers	AD	Definitive	1997-Aug-08	France, Italy
South Africa	Ropes & cables of iron or steel	AD	Definitive	2002-Aug-28	Germany, United Kingdom
South Africa	Self-copy paper	AD	Definitive	2002-Jul-19	Belgium, Germany, United Kingdom
South Africa	Suspension PVC	AD	Definitive	1997-Mar-27	France, United Kingdom
South Africa	Uncoated woodfree paper	AD	Definitive	1998-Feb-13	Poland, Sweden
Thailand	Cold-rolled flat stainless steel	AD	Definitive	2003-Mar-13	Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Italy, Finland, Sweden
Thailand	Hot-rolled flat in coils and not in coils	AD	Definitive	2003-May-27	Slovakia
Turkey	Activated earth and clays	SG	Definitive	2005-Jul-08	Germany, Greece, France, United Kingdom
Turkey	Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)	AD	Definitive	2003-Feb-06	Belgium, Germany, Greece, Italy, Hungary, Netherlands, Finland
Turkey	Voltmeters and Ammeters	SG	Definitive	2005-Aug-12	Germany, Spain, Italy, United Kingdom

Ukraine	Abrasive instruments	SG	Definitive	2005-Feb-01	European Union of 15
Ukraine	Biscuits	SG	Definitive	2004-Dec-23	Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Spain, France, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom
Ukraine	Cast iron parts for pumps	SG	Definitive	2005-Feb-18	European Union of 15
Ukraine	Instant coffee	SG	Definitive	2003-Mar-01	European Union of 15
Ukraine	Rolled and waterproofing material	SG	Definitive	2005-Aug-18	European Union of 25
Ukraine	Screw compressor installations	AD	Definitive	2005-Oct-17	Belgium, Italy, Finland
United States	Antifriction bearings	AD	Definitive	1989-May-15	United Kingdom, Italy
United States	Ball bearings	AD	Definitive	1999-May-15	France, Germany
United States	Brass sheet & strip	AD	Definitive	1987-Mar-06	France, Germany Italy
United States	Brass sheet & strip	CVD	Definitive	1987-Mar-06	France
United States	Chlorinated isocyanurates	AD	Definitive	2005-Jun-24	Spain
United States	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	AD	Definitive	1993-Aug-19	Germany, France
United States	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	CVD	Definitive	1993-Aug-17	France
United States	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	AD	Definitive	1993-Aug-19	Sweden, UK, Germany, Belgium, Finland, Poland Spain
United States	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	CVD	Definitive	1999-Dec-29	Italy
United States	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	CVD	Definitive	1993-Jul-09	United Kingdom
United States	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	CVD	Definitive	1993-Aug-17	Spain Germany, France, Belgium, Sweden
United States	Cut-to-length carbon-quality steel plate	AD	Definitive	2000-Feb-10	Italy
United States	Grain-oriented silicon electrical steel	AD	Definitive	1994-Aug-12	Italy

United States	Grain-oriented silicon electrical steel	CVD	Definitive	1994-Jun-07	Italy
United States	Granular polytetrafluoroethylene resin	AD	Definitive	1988-Aug-30	Italy
United States	Hot-rolled carbon steel flat products	AD	Definitive	2001-Nov-29	Netherlands
United States	Low enriched uranium	AD	Definitive	2002-Feb-13	France
United States	Oil country tubular goods	AD	Definitive	1995-Aug-11	Italy
United States	Oil country tubular goods	CVD	Definitive	1995-Aug-10	Italy
United States	Pasta	AD	Definitive	1996-Jul-24	Italy
United States	Pasta	CVD	Definitive	1996-Jul-24	Italy
United States	Pressure sensitive plastic tape	AD	Definitive	1977-Oct-21	Italy
United States	Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	AD	Definitive	2005-May-10	Sweden, Finland, Netherlands
United States	Seamless line and pressure pipe	AD	Definitive	1995-Aug-03	Germany
United States	Sorbitol	AD	Definitive	1982-Apr-09	France
United States	Stainless steel angle	AD	Expired	2001-May-18	Spain
United States	Stainless steel bar	AD	Definitive	2002-Mar-07	UK, France, Italy, Germany
United States	Stainless steel bar	CVD	Definitive	2002-Mar-08	Italy
United States	Stainless steel bar	AD	Definitive	1995-Mar-02	Spain
United States	Stainless steel butt-weld pipe fittings	AD	Definitive	2001-Feb-23	Italy
United States	Stainless steel plates in coils	AD	Definitive	1999-May-21	Belgium, Italy
United States	Stainless steel plates in coils	CVD	Definitive	1999-May-11	Belgium, Italy,
United States	Stainless steel sheet and strip in coils	AD	Definitive	1999-Jul-27	Germany, Italy
United States	Stainless steel sheet and strip in coils	CVD	Definitive	1999-Aug-06	Italy
United States	Stainless steel wire rod	AD	Definitive	1998-Sep-15	Sweden, Spain, Italy
United States	Stainless steel wire rod	AD	Definitive	1994-Jan-28	France

United States	Steel concrete reinforcing bars	AD	Definitive	2001-Sep-07	Latvia, Poland
United States	Sulphanilic Acid	AD	Definitive	2002-Nov-08	Hungary, Portugal
United States	Sulphanilic Acid	CVD	Definitive	2003-Nov-08	Hungary
Venezuela	Blue-veined cheese	CVD	Definitive	1994-May-24	Denmark, Netherlands
Venezuela	Paper and paperboard	SG	Definitive	2004-Jun-06	European Union of 15
Venezuela	Potato starch	CVD	Definitive	2004-Jun-07	European Union of 15