



COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

Brussels, 23.11.2005
SEC(2005) 1519

COMMISSION STAFF WORKING DOCUMENT

ANNEX TO

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

**ON THIRD COUNTRY ANTI-DUMPING, ANTI-SUBSIDY AND SAFEGUARD
ACTION AGAINST THE COMMUNITY (2004)**

{COM(2005)594 final}

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACTIONS BY COUNTRY	4
1. UNITED STATES	4
1.1. Some notable US cases	4
1.1.1. Privatisation methodology (countervailing duties) (DS 212)	4
1.1.2. "Zeroing": Laws, regulations and methodology for calculating dumping margins (DS294).....	5
1.1.3. The use of "adverse inferences" – the Firth Rixson case (DS319).....	6
2. INDIA	6
2.1. Some notable cases	7
2.1.1. Anti-dumping investigation on imports of coated paper inter alia, from the Community.....	7
3. RUSSIA AND UKRAINE.....	7
3.1. Some notable cases	8
3.1.1. Russian anti-dumping investigation into imports of stainless steel from the EC	8
3.1.2. Safeguard investigation into imports of electric lamps.....	8
4. CHINA	8
4.1. Some notable Chinese cases.....	9
4.1.1. Chloroform: Imposition of definitive duties	9
4.1.2. Hydrazine Hydrate: Imposition of provisional duties.....	9
4.1.3. Interim review on definitive measures on Catechol from the Community	9
4.1.4. New investigations opened	9
5. INDONESIA.....	10
5.1. Some notable cases	10
5.1.1. Anti-dumping investigations on coated and uncoated paper from Finland	10
6. LATIN AMERICA	10
6.1. Some notable cases	11
6.1.1. Mexican provisional countervailing duties on olive oil.....	11
6.1.2. Peru: safeguard investigation on certain made-up textile articles.....	11
6.1.3. Argentina: Extension of the countervailing duties on wheat gluten	12

6.1.4.	Argentinean review of the anti-subsidy measures on olive oil	12
7.	AUSTRALIA	13
7.1.	Some notable cases	13
7.1.1.	Countervailing duty investigation on olive oil from Italy, Spain and Greece and anti-dumping investigation on olive oil from Italy and Spain.....	13
8.	Measures in force at the end of 2003 and 2004	15
9.	Investigations opened in 2003 and 2004.....	17
10.	Measures imposed in 2004.....	19
11.	Investigations initiated in 2004	21
12.	All measures in force on 31 December 2004 (definitive and provisional)	23

ACTIONS BY COUNTRY

1. UNITED STATES

At the end of 2004, the US had a total of 53 trade defence measures in force against imports from the Community. The majority of the measures take the form of anti-dumping duties (40), while 13 are countervailing measures. This compares to 2003 where there were 36 anti dumping measures and 17 countervailing measures in force against the EU. Steel remains the main target of US TDI activity, followed by chemicals and agriculture.

The United States continues to put forward its own specific interpretation of the relevant WTO agreements, an interpretation that often leaves room for challenge as demonstrated by the significant number of panels the US has lost in cases involving all three types of trade defence instruments in the past two years. The major events in 2004 relate to measures subject to WTO dispute settlement proceedings and, in particular, the initiation of a WTO case on “zeroing” and the establishment of an implementation panel in the privatization case.

Although US investigations are generally open and transparent, the proceedings are burdensome and require a very high level of expertise. Exporters, therefore, often have no other option than resorting to costly legal counsel to defend their interests.

Other aspects of the US trade practice closely followed by the EC were the Byrd Amendment, the US “*sunset reviews*” methodology and the modification in the certification requirements proposed by the US Department of Commerce (‘DOC’).¹

As regards sunset reviews, the US terminated in 2004 the CVD case on stainless steel wire rod from Italy. It was the first time since the introduction of the Uruguay Round Agreements that a case involving European companies was closed by the DOC during a sunset review. Unfortunately, the DOC did not, in other similar cases, adopt the same approach and decided to continue the measures despite the evidence that subsidization was no longer likely to continue or recur. Keeping these measures artificially alive is not only WTO inconsistent but also demonstrates that the US practice on sunset reviews should undergo some form of revision. The EC will in 2005 decide whether to pursue this issue further with the US.

1.1. Some notable US cases

1.1.1. *Privatisation methodology (countervailing duties) (DS 212)*

In December 2002, the WTO Appellate Body (AB) concluded that a privatization at arm’s length and for fair market value creates a presumption that no benefit accrues to the privatised company. This presumption can be rebutted if the investigating authority can demonstrate that the Government, at the time of the privatization, seriously interfered with the proper functioning of the market and created “market distortions”. The US was invited by the AB to

¹ DOC was proposing to introduce stricter certification rules in AD/CVD investigations and to consider a criminal offence any false declaration provided by foreign interested parties.

bring their methodology in the 12 cases concerned into conformity with WTO law, by 8 November 2003 at the latest.

The US, in accordance with their domestic legislation, developed a new “*change-in-ownership*” methodology² (Section 123 of the US law), which they then applied to the 12 cases brought by the EC before the WTO (Section 129)³.

On 7 November 2003, the US issued their final determinations. In eight out of the twelve cases under review, the DOC found that the companies were privatized at arm’s length, for a fair market value and that there were no “*market distortions*”. As a consequence, four cases were terminated because the subsidy was found to be *de minimis* and the remaining four had their duty rates substantially reduced. Less positive was the result of the four “*sunset reviews*” where the measures continued unchanged.

Despite the important improvements brought by the new US privatization methodology, the EC has reserved its position on certain aspects of the approach which it still considers unsatisfactory (e.g. application to sunset review cases). After a new series of consultations with the US, the Commission decided to pursue a 21.5 panel against the US. This panel was established on 27 September 2004 and the final report is due on 14 June 2005. In the 21.5 case, the EC challenged three sunset reviews, alleging that the DOC had erred in the case of *Corrosion-resistant steel from France* by finding that 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.

1.1.2. “Zeroing”: Laws, regulations and methodology for calculating dumping margins (DS294)

The DOC consistently carries out its dumping calculations by failing to give credit for non-dumped transactions (a method known as “zeroing”) in a way that the Commission considers inconsistent with the WTO ADA Agreement. Indeed, the practice followed by the US is in essence identical to the one that was condemned in *European Communities – Bed Linen from India* (DS141).

The US applies “zeroing” both in new investigations and in the yearly reviews of existing orders (administrative reviews). This results 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 has 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”.

For the foregoing reasons, the Commission requested consultations with the US under the *WTO Dispute Settlement Procedures*. Two rounds of consultations were held in 2003, but

² “*Notice of Final modification of Agency Practice under Section 123 of the URAA*”, FR 68 37125 of 23 June 2003.

³ These cases involve France, Italy, Germany, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom.

these failed to resolve the dispute as the US confirmed that the “zeroing” practice would be continued. A panel was therefore requested by the EC on 6 February 2004 and established in March. The panel proceedings started in October 2004 and the final panel report is expected towards the end of September 2005.

1.1.3. The use of “adverse inferences” – the Firth Rixson case (DS319)

In March 2002, the DOC imposed an anti-dumping duty of 125.77% on imports of stainless steel bars from the United Kingdom made by Firth Rixson Special Steels Limited (FRSS). This very high duty rate was the direct result of the rejection by the DOC of the data provided by FRSS during the investigation; the DOC then refused to conduct a verification visit and established a duty on the basis of adverse facts available, i.e. the margin of dumping alleged by the complainant. To justify this treatment, the DOC alleged that FRSS had failed to comply to the best of their ability with the requests for information made by the DOC.

The EC believes that the DOC has breached the WTO Anti-Dumping Agreement (notably the provisions of Article 6 and Annex II thereof) by applying adverse facts available in this case. The anti-dumping duty imposed bears no relationship to any margin of dumping found for any exporter during the proceeding. Furthermore, this seems to be a recurring problem, since the recourse to adverse facts available has been a feature of US dumping cases for many years.

Given the egregious nature of the case in question, and the recurring aspect of the problem, the Commission decided to request WTO consultations in this case. The request, dated 9 November 2004, challenged not only the determination by the DOC on imports from FRSS, but also the relevant provisions of US legislation, notably Section 776 of the 1930 US Tariff Act. The WTO consultations were held in Geneva on 11 January 2005; unfortunately, the consultations failed to solve the dispute.

2. INDIA

At the end of 2004, India had a total of 36 trade defence measures in force against imports from the Community. The vast majority of these measures take the form of anti-dumping duties (34), while 2 are safeguard measures. This represents a slight increase from year 2003 where India had 29 AD measures in force against the EC. However, in terms of new investigations India only opened 3 in 2004 compared to 7 the year before. The sector most affected in 2004 remains the chemical industry, followed by the pharmaceutical sector.

The EC has in the last years been one of the strongest critics of India’s anti-dumping practice which it considered in violation with WTO rules. The problems in the Indian cases mainly referred to the highly insufficient injury and causality analysis, the failure to provide meaningful disclosure documents and a continuous disregard of arguments presented by EC exporters and the EC. The EC along with China and Taiwan have most often been targeted by Indian anti-dumping measures. In many cases, the anti-dumping measures have been imposed in cases where the Indian domestic producer enjoys a quasi monopoly status and where imports are minimal.

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. India has shown willingness to address some of the shortfalls raised by the EC. In addition, at the request of the EC, initiated reviews on a number of the cases subject to WTO consultations. The EC is closely monitoring the developments of these reviews.

Although India still remains the world's largest user of the anti-dumping instrument, some improvement to its anti-dumping practice has nevertheless been noted in 2004. In particular, the latest investigations have shown a more thorough and critical analysis both of the situation of the complaining industry, the impact of imports and of other factors which may at the same time be injuring the domestic industry. In addition, there has also been a noticeable improvement in the factual contents of the published decisions and disclosure documents.

2.1. Some notable cases

2.1.1. Anti-dumping investigation on imports of coated paper inter alia, from the Community

This anti dumping investigation, initiated in June of 2003, caused significant concern amongst EC exporters, mainly from Finland and Sweden, due to the very large number of paper products potentially affected (around 55 MEUR/year)

DG Trade intervened at a very early stage in the proceeding on account of the very low standard of initiation of this investigation. In its submission to the Indian authorities, the Commission underlined, *inter alia*, that the evidence presented in the petition did not support the claim of injury of the domestic industry since the latter was enjoying increased sales and substantial profits in the period where the alleged dumped imports were said to have occurred. The EC intervened again at the stage of the public hearing where the EC Delegation in Delhi reiterated the EC's serious concerns as to the general compatibility of this investigation with WTO rules. Finally, in December 2004, the Indian authorities communicated that the investigation would be terminated without measures in view of the lack of injury to the domestic industry.

3. RUSSIA AND UKRAINE

Russia and Ukraine have both intensified their trade defence activity in 2004. Russia initiated two safeguard and an anti-dumping investigation, which were still on-going at the end of 2004. Ukraine equally initiated two safeguard and an anti-dumping investigation. One of these cases (manganese ores) was terminated in 2004 without the imposition of measures while in the case of the other five investigations measures were imposed in the first quarter of 2005.

These investigations are probably the result of increased imports into Russia and Ukraine originating in neighbouring CIS countries with which they have contracted trade liberalisation agreements. The Commission has raised this issue on several occasions with the authorities of Russia and Ukraine and urged them to solve problems with their CIS partners at regional level, rather than taking *erga omnes* safeguard action.

3.1. Some notable cases

3.1.1. Russian anti-dumping investigation into imports of stainless steel from the EC

Russia initiated the anti-dumping proceeding concerning stainless steel from the EC on 22 October. The investigation covers 26 product groups for which EC exports to Russia amount to around 75 MEUR/year.

The initiation of this case was very controversial. The Commission was alerted by EC exporters to the fact that the dumping claim made by the Russian industry against them was based on inaccurate data, mainly concerning the price at which EC goods are exported to Russia. The Commission objected in writing to the Russian authorities, insisting that the allegations set out in the complainant were grossly inaccurate and should have been properly verified by the Russian authorities before opening the investigation.

Discussions between the Commission and the Russian authorities continued into 2005, whereby Commission services co-ordinated their action with the European industry involved. At the oral hearing which took place in February 2005, the Commission raised further objections to this case, concerning both dumping and injury allegations made by the complainant and invited the Russian authorities not to pursue this case any further. Discussions continue on this case with the Russian authorities.

3.1.2. Safeguard investigation into imports of 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.

In examining the case, the Commission came to the conclusion that any problem encountered by the Russian domestic industry was largely attributable to imports from CIS countries, in particular Kyrgyzstan which, as a result of a trade liberalisation agreement contracted in the CIS, was able to increase its exports to Russia very substantially. The Commission urged Russia to refrain from penalising countries that bear no responsibility for the surge in imports. It invited the Russian authorities to terminate the *erga omnes* investigation and to seek a solution at bilateral or regional level. The EC will continue to closely monitor the case.

4. CHINA

Since China joined the WTO in December 2001, the Commission has followed all Chinese trade defence cases closely in order to ensure that they meet the relevant WTO rules.

During 2004, anti-dumping investigations were opened by China on 3 products originating either in the EC as a whole or in one or more of its Member States. This compares with 4 anti-dumping investigations opened against imports from the EC in 2003. China opened one interim review on the measures in place on imports of catechol from the EC. There were no safeguard or anti-subsidy investigations initiated by China during 2004.

At the end of 2004, a total of 5 definitive anti-dumping measures were in force against imports from the Community compared to 3 at the end of 2003. There were no safeguard or CVD measures in place on imports from the EC.

While China may still be considered as a relatively new user of the trade defence instruments, it is important that it applies standards which are fully in conformity with the WTO Agreement. In this context, the Commission continues to have some concerns regarding the Chinese approach to anti-dumping cases. The main areas of concern to date relate to poor standards for initiation, inadequate disclosure, fears regarding the treatment of confidential data, burdensome demands for information to exporters and insufficient evidence relating to injury. The Commission continues to raise concerns with China at every opportunity. The Commission also continues to provide technical assistance to China in order to help further improve the standards applied by them in conducting investigations; a seminar was held in June 2004.

4.1. Some notable Chinese cases

4.1.1. 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.

4.1.2. Hydrazine Hydrate: Imposition of provisional duties

China had initiated on 17 December 2003 an anti-dumping investigation on imports of Hydrazine Hydrate originating, inter alia, in France, the USA, Japan and South Korea. The Commission followed the matter with the EC industries concerned which had co-operated in the case. On 6 August 2004, provisional anti-dumping duties were imposed the Chinese Ministry of Commerce on imports originating in France, ranging from 118% to 120%. On 16 December 2004 the Chinese Ministry of Commerce extended the duration of the investigation for a further period of 6 months, until June 2005. The Commission continues to follow developments in the case.

4.1.3. Interim review on definitive measures on Catechol from the Community

On 27 August 2003, China imposed definitive anti-dumping measures on imports of Catechol from the Community with duties ranging between 20% and 79%. 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 is 1 September 2003 to 31 August 2004 and the outcome of the review is still pending. The complainant in this case is the sole producer of catechol in China and appears to be using the anti-dumping instrument aggressively against imports of catechol as a further investigation was initiated against imports of the product from the USA and Japan in May 2005.

4.1.4. New investigations opened

The 3 anti-dumping investigations initiated by China in 2004 concerning imports from the EC or Member States relate to Dimethyl Cyclosiloxan in July (DE and UK), Benzofuranol in August (EC) and Ethylene propylene Diene Rubber-EPDR in August (NL).

The Commission informed the relevant industries concerned and offered assistance and advice during the proceedings. It continues to monitor the cases to ensure that they are carried out in accordance with WTO rules.

5. INDONESIA

5.1. Some notable cases

5.1.1. Anti-dumping investigations on coated and uncoated paper from Finland

On 10 February 2003, Indonesia initiated two separate anti-dumping investigations simultaneously on imports of “uncoated writing and printing papers” and “coated fine paper” originating, inter alia, in Finland.

Working closely with the Finnish industry concerned, the Commission made submissions to KADI, the Indonesian investigating authority, regarding certain inadequacies of the complaints. In particular, concerns were raised regarding the lack of prima facie evidence contained therein on injury and causation. There were no provisional measures imposed in the case.

In November 2004, definitive anti-dumping measures ranging between 20.44% and 60.40% were imposed on imports into China from Finland of Uncoated writing and printing paper, while the petition relating to coated writing and printing paper was dismissed. This outcome was welcomed by the main Finnish exporter as their largest exports to Indonesia are of coated writing and printing paper, which can continue free of anti-dumping duties.

6. LATIN AMERICA

During 2004, Chile, Columbia and Peru each opened one safeguard investigation cases. In terms of new measures Venezuela imposed two measures (safeguard and countervailing), Peru, Chile and Brazil each imposed one measure (respectively countervailing, safeguard and anti dumping).

The Latin American countries such as Argentina, Brazil, Mexico and Venezuela are becoming more active in the area of countervailing actions, in particular directed towards EC exports. This trend can probably be explained by the fact that these countries are increasing their presence on the world market for processed agricultural goods and therefore consider EC subsidies to agriculture-regardless of their form-to be harmful to their domestic production and exports. Argentina, for instance, extended in 2004 countervailing duties on imports of three types of EC processed agricultural products, i.e. olive oil, wheat gluten and canned peaches, solely on the basis of the existence of EC agricultural subsidies and despite the fact that the 2002 currency crisis made imports of these products substantially more expensive. The EC has in May 2005 requested WTO consultations with Argentina.

6.1. Some notable cases

6.1.1. Mexican provisional countervailing duties on olive oil

In July 2003, Mexico initiated a countervailing duty investigation on imports of olive oil from the EC. The main exporting Member States are Italy and Spain and the trade interest is around €18.5 million (2002 figures). On 10 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 at the latest in mid-January 2005 since according to WTO rules this was the end of the maximum duration (18 months) of a countervailing duty investigation. The Mexican authorities have nevertheless continued the investigation.

The Commission has been very involved in this case since its initiation. Along with exporting Member States, mainly Spain and Italy, the Commission prepared the reply to the subsidy questionnaire to submit all relevant information to Mexico on the alleged subsidies. The EC also participated-together with a representative of the Spanish authorities-in the public hearing on the case on 30 November 2004.

The case raises serious concerns both in terms of substance and procedures. The evidence at hand appears to indicate that there is no domestic industry in Mexico which would have been injured by imports. The complainant had ceased production one year before the complaint was lodged for reasons which seems unrelated to imports. Moreover, the Commission has argued that Mexico did not carry out the necessary investigation to collect evidence supporting the argument that the subsidy granted to olive growers has actually benefited EC exporters of olive oil to Mexico.

In order to clarify some of the more problematic aspects of the case, the EC twice used the prerogative of Article 13.2 of the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (ASCM) to bilaterally consult with Mexico (November 2003 and December 2004). In addition, further to the imposition of provisional duties, the EC conducted consultation in Geneva under Article 4 of the Dispute Settlement Undertaking, covering the apparent breaches of the ASCM and the Agreement on Agriculture: abuse of initiation, lack of domestic industry and of proper injury finding. The issues arising with this case has been continuously raised in the context of the EC-Mexico Joint Committee meetings that took place in the meantime.

The Commission will continue monitoring developments and awaits Mexico's definitive decision.

6.1.2. Peru: safeguard investigation on certain made-up textile articles

The case was opened on 22 August 2004, *ex officio*, further to the expiry of the provisional measures imposed on textiles from China on the basis of paragraph 16 of China's Protocol of Accession to the WTO. An *erga omnes* safeguard was the solution found by Peru to respond to its domestic industry that was pleading for action.

The product concerned by the investigation is textiles falling under Chapter 61, 62, 63.02 and 63.09 (i.e. Articles of apparel and clothing accessories and other made-up textile articles, sets, excluding table sets).

The Commission has participated actively in this case since its initiation. It has communicated to the Peruvian authorities that it has serious doubts that WTO standards have been respected, notably as regards the existence of “*unforeseen developments*” and the existence of serious injury and causation. The Commission also strongly urged Peru to carefully consider all the implications before initiating an *erga omnes* action on a very sensitive sector.

On 14 October 2004, Peru applied provisional duties – in the form of minimum import prices – on certain sub-categories of the product concerned (twenty CN codes). However, the provisional measures have almost no impact on EC exports, given that they only apply to a restricted sub-category of products and prices of EC exports are normally higher than the fixed minimum import prices.

In May 2005, Peru eventually decided not to apply definitive measures and terminated the investigation. Provisional measures were repealed.

6.1.3. *Argentina: Extension of the countervailing duties on wheat gluten*

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 and increased the level of duty to US\$ 204,74/tonne (US\$123,30/tonne).

The EC had already at the time of the original imposition in 1998 vigorously contested the legality of the CVD measures since the product in question did not-directly nor indirectly-benefit from any subsidies. The subsidies countervailed by Argentina were granted to co-or by-products of wheat gluten (e.g. starch, glucose). Despite this, Argentina had without any supporting analysis assumed that the subsidies in question were fully transferable to EC exports of wheat gluten.

The initiation by Argentina, *ex officio*, of an expiry review was therefore met with strong protest by the Commission which throughout the review maintained that the original measures-and consequently any review – were contrary to WTO rules. In October 2003, the EC sought and held consultations with Argentina under Article 11.3 of the WTO Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures, but this did not lead to any changes. The Commission continued nevertheless to make substantial submissions and interventions at bilateral level with Argentina.

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

Following Argentina’s decision to extend-and increase-the measures, the EC requested in May 2005 WTO consultations which were held in July 2005.

6.1.4. *Argentinean review of the anti-subsidy measures on olive oil*

In July 1998 Argentina imposed, for a two year period, definitive countervailing duties of US\$1,0/kg on packed olive oil and US\$0.80/kg on olive oil in bulk. The duties were extended for another two-year-period in June 2001, following a sunset review. These measures were due to expire in June 2003, but Argentina initiated another *ex officio* sunset review procedure just before the expiry date.

The issue at stake here is similar to that for the wheat gluten case. The investigating authorities are targeting 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 naturally requires that the analysis demonstrate how the benefit passes through to olive oil producers. The Argentinean authorities have consistently failed to do so, which the Commission views as a clear breach of the requirements of the WTO SCM Agreement.

The Commission has also objected to the fact that Argentina, by initiating this investigation *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.

The result of the sunset review was published in December 2004 and extends the measures for an additional 3 years. The EC has decided to pursue the case at the WTO and requested in May 2005 WTO consultations with Argentina which were held in July 2005.

7. 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 2004, Australia had a total of 8 trade defence measures in force against imports from the Community compared to 7 last year. The majority of these take the form of anti-dumping duties (5), while 3 are countervailing measures. During 2004, Australia initiated only one investigation (anti dumping) and imposed no new measures. Australia also terminated 2 AD measures.

7.1. Some notable cases

7.1.1. Countervailing duty investigation on olive oil from Italy, Spain and Greece and anti-dumping investigation on olive oil from Italy and Spain

On 12 November 2003, Australia initiated a countervailing duty investigation into olive oil from Italy, Spain and Greece. At the same time, it initiated an anti-dumping investigation into imports of olive oil from Italy and shortly after, another AD investigation into imports of olive oil from Spain.

The EC had a strong interest in this case, both from an economic and a policy perspective. Australia represents one of the largest markets for EC exports of olive oil worldwide (approximately 60 MEUR/year). The olive oil sector has huge growth potential: worldwide consumption is increasing rapidly and local producers are setting up business in countries where the climatic conditions are favourable to olive oil production. A number of these new olive oil producing countries (e.g. Argentina, Mexico and Peru – see previous sections) have also launched CVD actions against the EC and it is rumoured that other countries could follow suit.

In terms of overall policy, this case had very important implications for the EC. The olive oil regime has been overhauled in recent years and will be fully replaced by a new regime in 2006. The changes affecting olive oil should be seen within the general reform of the EC Common Agricultural Policy (CAP), which will “decouple” aid from production quantities. In

spite of this, Australia was trying to demonstrate that the current subsidies granted to olive farmers “pass through” directly and in full to the exported olive oil. The Commission has closely cooperated with EC exporters and affected Member States to demonstrate to Australia that this was not the case.

The Commission raised, amongst other things, the problem of Australia’s definition of “like product” and the size of its domestic industry. The Australian olive oil industry has only recently established itself and has a domestic market share of just 2%. With such a low market share, the Commission considers it difficult to accept the Australian claim of injury and causality. The Commission also argued that Australia has not demonstrated how the benefits granted to olive growers “pass through” to the oil exported to Australia, nor has it adjusted its analysis in the light of the recently adopted reform of the EC support scheme to olive farmers. Finally, the Commission objected to the methodology applied by the Australian authorities to calculate dumping margins, as well as for their failure to meet standards of disclosure.

Following the submissions made by the Commission, Australia, on 24 May 2004 terminated both the AD and CVD investigations without imposition of measures. For the CVD investigation, this was on the grounds that the aid was not actionable. For the AD investigation, the authorities established dumping for 3 out of 6 companies, but concluded that this was not the cause of injury.

The CVD finding could be very important for the EC, since its findings can be used as ammunition in other third countries’ investigations concerning similar cases, involving agricultural or processed agricultural products. On 8 June 2004, the complainant lodged an application with the Trade Measures Review Officer (‘TMRC’) for a review of the decision to terminate the investigation into the alleged subsidisation of olive oil exported to Australia from Greece, Italy and Spain. However, the TMRC upheld the decision to terminate the investigation, by stating that there was no evidence that production aid to olive growers confers a benefit on the export of olive oil to Australia from Greece, Italy and Spain. Subsequently, the complainant twice appealed to the Federal Court under the Administrative Decision (Judicial Review) Act. On 31 May 2005, the Federal Court handed down its judgement and rejected the appeal on all counts.

8. MEASURES IN FORCE AT THE END OF 2003 AND 2004

Country	AD		CVD		SG		TOTAL	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
ARGENTINA	4	6	3	3	2	0	9	9
AUSTRALIA	4	5	3	3	0	0	7	8
BRAZIL	10	12	0	0	2	1	12	13
BULGARIA	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2
CANADA	8	9	2	3	0	0	10	12
CHILE	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
CHINA	4	7	0	0	0	0	4	7
COLOMBIA	2	1	0	0	0	0	2	1
CZECH REP	1	0	0	0	5	0	6	0
ECUADOR	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2
EGYPT	2	5	0	0	0	0	2	5
HUNGARY	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0
INDIA	29	34	0	0	3	2	32	36
INDONESIA	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2
ISRAEL	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
JORDAN	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	4
KOREA	2	2	0	0	1	0	3	2
LITHUANIA	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
MALAYSIA	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
MEXICO	4	4	1	2	0	0	5	6
MOLDOVA	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
MOROCCO	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
NEW ZEALAND	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2

PAKISTAN	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
PERU	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	2
PHILIPPINE S	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4
POLAND	0	0	0	0	5	0	5	0
RUSSIA	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	2
SLOVAKIA	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
SOUTH AFRICA	11	10	0	0	0	0	11	10
TAIPEI	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
THAILAND	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	3
TURKEY	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
UKRAINE	0	0	0	0	1	3	1	3
USA	36	40	17	13	0	0	53	53
VENEZUEL A	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	3
TOTAL	125	146	29	29	38	24	192	199

9. INVESTIGATIONS OPENED IN 2003 AND 2004

Country	AD		CVD		SG		TOTAL	
	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004	2003	2004
Argentina	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Australia	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
Bosnia Herzegovina	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Brazil	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Bulgaria	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
Byelorussia	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4
Canada	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1
Chile	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
China	4	3	0	0	0	0	4	3
Colombia	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Ecuador	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	0
Estonia	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
India	7	2	0	0	0	1	7	3
Indonesia	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1
Jamaica	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Korea	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Mexico	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Moldova	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
New Zealand	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Peru	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Philippines	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
Russia	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	3

South Africa	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Turkey	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	5
Ukraine	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	3
Uruguay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
USA	3	2	0	0	0	0	3	2
Venezuela	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
TOTAL	19	13	3	1	9	19	31	33

10. MEASURES IMPOSED IN 2004

Country	Product	Case initiated against	Exporting Member states	Type	Date of imposition
Brazil	Horse nail or horse shoe nail	Finland	Finland	AD	2004-06-03
Canada	Hot rolled carbon steel plate	Czech Republic	Czech Republic	AD	2004-01-09
Chile	Wheat and wheat flour	EC	Spain	SG	2004-12-10
China	Chloroform-trichloromethane	France, Germany, UK	France, Germany, UK	AD	2004-11-30
China	Chloroprene Rubber	EC		AD	2004-12-01
China	Hydrazine Hydrate	France	France	AD	2004-08-03
Ecuador	Ceramic tiles	EC		SG	2004-02-13
India	Caprolactam (6-Hexanelactum)	EC except Netherlands	EC except Netherlands	AD	2004-09-16
India	Propylene glycol	Spain	Spain	AD	2004-08-20
India	PVC paste resin	Italy Spain	Italy Spain	AD	2004-09-20
Indonesia	Uncoated writing and printing paper	Finland	Finland	AD	2004-11-11
Korea	Stainless Steel Bars	Spain	Spain	AD	2004-07-30
Mexico	Olive Oil	EC	Spain, Italy	CVD	2004-06-10
Moldova	Sugar	EC		SG	2004-01-01
Peru	Textile products	Italy, Spain	Italy, Spain	CVD	2004-10-13
Ukraine	Biscuits	EC		SG	2004-12-23
USA	Chlorinated isocyanurates	Spain	Spain	AD	2004-12-16
USA	Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	Finland, Netherlands, Sweden	Finland, Netherlands, Sweden	AD	2004-12-27
USA	Thermal Transfer Ribbons	France	France	AD	2004-03-08

Venezuela	Paper and paperboard	EC	Definitive	SG	2004-06-06
Venezuela	Potato starch	EC	Definitive	CVD	2004-06-07

11. INVESTIGATIONS INITIATED IN 2004

	Country	Product	Type	Date of Initiation	Case initiated against
1	AUSTRALIA	Polyvinyl chloride homopolymer resin	AD	2004-12-10	Hungary
2	BOSNIA HERZEGOVINA	Washing preparations and cleaning preparations	SG	2004-11-03	EC
3	BYELORUSSIA	Polyester yarn	SG	2004-09-06	EC
4	BYELORUSSIA	Poultry	SG	2004-08-11	EC
5	BYELORUSSIA	Sugar Confectionnaries	SG	2004-07-20	EC
6	BYELORUSSIA	Tubes and Pipes	SG	2004-08-02	EC
7	CANADA	Laminate flooring	AD	2004-10-04	Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Poland
8	CHILE	Wheat and wheat flour	SG	2004-12-10	EC
9	CHINA	Benzofuranol; (7-Hydroxy or Furan phenol)	AD	2004-08-12	EC
10	CHINA	Dimethyl Cyclosilonax	AD	2004-07-16	Germany, UK
11	CHINA	Ethylene-Propylene-non-Conjugated Diene Rubber (EPDM)	AD	2004-08-10	Netherlands
12	COLOMBIA	Electric irons	SG	2004-01-26	EC
13	INDIA	Acrylonitrile butadiene rubber (NBR)	AD	2004-08-17	EC except Germany
14	INDIA	Certain Rubber Chemicals	AD	2004-08-17	Belgium, Germany, Italy
15	INDIA	Starch from tapioca (manioc)	SG	2004-07-07	EC
16	INDONESIA	Ceramic tableware	SG	2004-10-19	EC
17	MOLDOVA	Cosmetics	SG	2004-06-18	EC

18	NEW ZEALAND	Oral Liquid Paracetamol	AD	2004-10-01	Ireland
19	PERU	Textile products	CVD	2004-08-22	Italy, Spain
20	RUSSIA	Flat rolled stainless steel (hot and cold rolled, containing nickel)	AD	2004-10-27	EC
21	RUSSIA	Lamps	SG	2004-09-14	EC
22	RUSSIA	White sugar	SG	2004-06-09	EC
23	SOUTH AFRICA	Cheddar cheese	AD	2004-06-25	Ireland
24	TURKEY	Activated earth and clays	SG	2004-07-17	EC
25	TURKEY	Glassware	SG	2004-07-27	EC
26	TURKEY	Thermometers	SG	2004-07-26	EC
27	TURKEY	Unframed glass mirrors	SG	2004-07-17	EC
28	TURKEY	Voltmeters and Ammeters	SG	2004-07-17	EC
29	UKRAINE	Pumps / parts of pumps	SG	2004-03-15	EC
30	UKRAINE	Roofing and facing products of asphalt or of similar material, in rolls	SG	2004-10-20	EC
31	UKRAINE	Screw compressor installations	AD	2004-08-12	Belgium, Finland, Italy
32	USA	Chlorinated isocyanurates	AD	2004-06-10	Spain
33	USA	Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	AD	2004-07-06	Finland, Netherlands, Sweden

12. ALL MEASURES IN FORCE ON 31 DECEMBER 2004 (DEFINITIVE AND PROVISIONAL)

	Country	Product	Type	Provisional or Definitive	Date of first imposition	Case initiated against	Exporting Member States
1	ARGENTINA	Calcium carbide	AD	Definitive	2001-11-21	Poland	Poland
2	ARGENTINA	Hot rolled steel (HRS)	AD	Definitive	2002-04-30	Slovakia	Slovakia
3	ARGENTINA	Hot-rolled iron sections, L-shaped, with equal sides	AD	Definitive	2002-01-11	Czech Republic	Czech Republic
4	ARGENTINA	Olive oil	CVD	Definitive	1998-06-25	EC	Greece, Italy, Spain
5	ARGENTINA	Peaches, preserved in water containing added sweetening matter, including syrup, preserved in any other form or in water	CVD	Definitive	1996-01-10	EC	Greece
6	ARGENTINA	Steel disc for agricultural machines	AD	Definitive	2001-07-30	Spain	Spain
7	ARGENTINA	Unglazed ceramic flags and paving, hearth or wall tiles, of fine earthenware "porcellanato", unpolished	AD	Definitive	1999-11-17	Italy	Italy
8	ARGENTINA	wheat gluten	CVD	Definitive	1998-07-22	EC	
9	ARGENTINA	Washing Machines	AD	Definitive	2002-02-28	Italy Spain	Italy Spain

10	AUSTRALIA	Air conditioners, split system caravan	AD	Definitive	2001-04-21	Italy	Italy
11	AUSTRALIA	Brandy, bottled	CVD	Definitive	2001-06-28	France	France
12	AUSTRALIA	Brandy, bulk	CVD	Definitive	2000-08-09	France	France
13	AUSTRALIA	Canned peaches	CVD	Definitive	1992-02-19	Greece	Greece
14	AUSTRALIA	Dichlorophenoxy acetic acid (2,4-D)	AD	Definitive	2003-03-24	UK	UK
15	AUSTRALIA	Polyethylene high density	AD	Definitive	2003-12-18	Sweden	Sweden
16	AUSTRALIA	Polyvinyl chloride homopolymer resin	AD	Definitive	2005-03-24	Hungary	Hungary
17	AUSTRALIA	Polyvinyl chloride homopolymer resin (PVC)	AD	Definitive	2000-03-24	Hungary	Hungary
18	BRAZIL	Canned peaches	AD	Suspended	2002-04-26	Greece	Greece
19	BRAZIL	Cold-rolled flat stainless steel	AD	Definitive	2000-05-26	France Spain	France Spain
20	BRAZIL	Horse nail or horse shoe nail	AD	Definitive	2004-06-03	Finland	Finland
21	BRAZIL	Hydroxyethyl cellulose	AD	Definitive	2000-04-19	Netherlands	Netherlands
22	BRAZIL	Insulin Products	AD	Suspended	2001-02-12	Denmark France	Denmark France
23	BRAZIL	Méthyl métacrylate	AD	Definitive	2001-03-14	France Germany Spain UK	France Germany Spain UK
24	BRAZIL	Milk powder	AD	Definitive	2001-02-23	EC	Denmark Ireland

25	BRAZIL	Phenol	AD	Definitive	2002-10-16	EC	Belgium Germany
26	BRAZIL	Polycarbonate resins	AD	Definitive	1999-07-26	Germany	Germany
27	BRAZIL	Sodium Tripoliphosphate (STPP)	AD	Definitive	1997-08-05	UK	UK
28	BRAZIL	Steel blade (for stone cutting)	AD	Definitive	2003-10-13	Italy	Italy
29	BRAZIL	Toys	SG	Definitive	1997-01-01	EC	Italy
30	BRAZIL	Vacuum blood containers made of glass and plastic	AD	Definitive	1998-10-16	UK	UK
31	BULGARIA	Ammonium nitrate	SG	Definitive	2002-12-29	EC	
32	BULGARIA	Crown corks	SG	Definitive	2002-11-29	EC	Germany Greece Italy UK
33	CANADA	Canned ham	CVD	Definitive	1984-08-07	Denmark, Netherlands	Denmark, Netherlands
34	CANADA	Cigarette tubes	AD	Definitive	1999-04-12	France	France
35	CANADA	Hot rolled carbon steel plate	AD	Definitive	2000-06-27	Finland	Finland
36	CANADA	Hot rolled carbon steel plate	AD	Definitive	2004-01-09	Czech Republic	Czech Republic
37	CANADA	Hot rolled carbon steel plate	AD	Definitive	1994-05-17	Italy Spain	Italy Spain
38	CANADA	Hot rolled carbon steel sheet	AD	Definitive	1999-07-02	France Slovakia	France Slovakia
39	CANADA	Refined	CVD	Definitive	1995-11-06	EC	

		sugar					
40	CANADA	Refined sugar	AD	Definitive	1995-11-06	Denmark Germany Netherlands UK	Denmark Germany Netherlands UK
41	CANADA	Refined sugar	CVD	Definitive	2000-11-03	EC	
42	CANADA	Reinforcing bar (steel)	AD	Definitive	2001-06-01	Latvia Poland	Latvia Poland
43	CANADA	Stainless Steel round bar	AD	Definitive	1999-03-04	France Germany Italy Spain Sweden UK	France Germany Italy Spain Sweden UK
44	CANADA	Steel plate	AD	Definitive	1999-05-17	Italy Spain	Italy Spain
45	CHILE	Wheat and wheat flour	SG	Provisional	2004-12-10	EC	Spain
46	CHINA	Acrylic Esters (Acid)	AD	Definitive	2001-06-09	Germany	Germany
47	CHINA	Caprolactam	AD	Definitive	2003-06-06	Belgium Germany Netherlands	Belgium Germany Netherlands
48	CHINA	Catechol	AD	Definitive	2003-08-27	France Italy	France Italy
49	CHINA	Chloroform-Trichloromethane	AD	Definitive	2004-11-30	France Germany UK	France Germany UK
50	CHINA	Chloroprene Rubber	AD	Provisional	2004-12-01	EC	
51	CHINA	Hydrazine Hydrate	AD	Provisional	2004-08-03	France	France
52	CHINA	Methylene Chloride	AD	Definitive	2002-06-20	Germany Netherlands UK	Germany Netherlands UK

53	COLOMBIA	Coffee grade fertilizers	AD	Definitive	1999-10-06	Belgium	Belgium
54	ECUADOR	Ceramic tiles	SG	Definitive	2004-02-13	EC	
55	ECUADOR	Medium Density Fiberboard	SG	Definitive	2003-07-16	EC	Belgium Germany
56	EGYPT	Common electric filament lamps from 25-200 watts-voltage up to 240 watts	AD	Definitive	2002-09-05	Hungary Italy Spain	Hungary Italy Spain
57	EGYPT	Reinforcing iron bars and rods hot rolled in irregular wound coil of iron or non alloy steel for construction purposes	AD	Definitive	1998-06-22	Latvia	Latvia
58	EGYPT	Stainless steel kitchen sinks	AD	Definitive	1998-06-28	Greece Spain	Greece Spain
59	EGYPT	Steel reinforcing bars	AD	Definitive	1998-06-28	Latvia	Latvia
60	EGYPT	Tyres for motor cars	AD	Definitive	1999-10-04	EC	
61	INDIA	Acrylic fibre	AD	Definitive	2002-10-09	Germany UK	Germany UK
62	INDIA	Acrylic fibre (below 1,5 denier)	AD	Definitive	2002-09-12	Italy	Italy
63	INDIA	Acrylonitrile butadiene rubber (NBR)	AD	Definitive	1997-07-30	Germany	Germany
64	INDIA	Aniline	AD	Definitive	2001-06-26	EC	

65	INDIA	B & W Photographic Paper	AD	Definitive	2000-12-21	France Hungary UK	France Hungary UK
66	INDIA	Bisphenol A (BPA)	SG	Definitive	2003-10-27	EC	Belgium
67	INDIA	Caprolactam (6-Hexanelactum)	AD	Definitive	2004-09-16	EC except Netherlands	EC except Netherlands
68	INDIA	Caustic soda	AD	Definitive	2001-06-26	France	France
69	INDIA	Caustic soda	AD	Definitive	2003-10-01	EC except France	EC except France
70	INDIA	Choline chloride	AD	Definitive	2001-11-26	EC	
71	INDIA	Cold rolled flat products stainless steel	AD	Definitive	2002-10-19	EC	
72	INDIA	D(-) Para Hydroxy Phenyl Glycine Base (PHPG)	AD	Definitive	2001-03-07	EC	
73	INDIA	Epichlorohydrin (ECH)	SG	Definitive	2003-10-29	EC	Belgium Germany
74	INDIA	Flexible slabstock polyol (molecular weight 3000-4000)	AD	Definitive	2002-10-31	EC	
75	INDIA	Graphite Electrodes	AD	Definitive	2003-01-31	Poland	Poland
76	INDIA	High styrene butadiene copolymer / High styrene resin/rubber (HSR)	AD	Definitive	2001-12-18	EC	
77	INDIA	Hydroxyl Amine Sulphate (HAS)	AD	Definitive	2001-03-28	EC	

78	INDIA	Methylene Chloride	AD	Definitive	2003-10-20	EC	
79	INDIA	Oxo Alcohols	AD	Definitive	2000-08-18	EC	
80	INDIA	Phenol	AD	Definitive	2003-02-13	EC	
81	INDIA	Photographic Paper	AD	Definitive	2000-12-21	France UK	France UK
82	INDIA	Potassium carbonate	AD	Provisional	2003-04-30	EC	
83	INDIA	Propylene glycol	AD	Definitive	2004-08-20	Spain	Spain
84	INDIA	Purified Therephtalic Acid (PTA)	AD	Definitive	2000-05-30	Spain	Spain
85	INDIA	PVC paste resin	AD	Definitive	2004-09-20	Italy Spain	Italy Spain
86	INDIA	Seamless tubes	AD	Definitive	2000-06-21	Austria Czech Republic	Austria Czech Republic
87	INDIA	Sodium Cyanide	AD	Definitive	2000-06-06	EC	
88	INDIA	Sodium Ferro Cyanide	AD	Definitive	1996-12-20	EC	
89	INDIA	Sodium hydrosulphite	AD	Definitive	2003-12-03	Germany	Germany
90	INDIA	Sodium nitrite	AD	Definitive	2002-03-28	EC	
91	INDIA	Theophylline & Caffeine	AD	Definitive	2001-07-30	EC	
92	INDIA	Thermal Sensitive Paper (TSP)	AD	Definitive	2000-04-06	EC	
93	INDIA	Vitamin A palmitate	AD	Definitive	2003-01-23	EC	
94	INDIA	Vitamin AB2D3K	AD	Definitive	2002-09-09	EC	
95	INDIA	Vitamin AD3	AD	Definitive	2002-05-21	EC	

		(500/100)					
96	INDIA	Vitamin C	AD	Definitive	2000-09-15	EC	
97	INDONESIA	Sorbitol	AD	Definitive	2001-03-12	EC	
98	INDONESIA	Uncoated writing and printing paper	AD	Definitive	2004-11-11	Finland	Finland
99	ISRAEL	Woven pile weather stripping	AD	Definitive	1998-11-18	Spain UK	Spain UK
100	JORDAN	Ceramic sanitary ware	SG	Definitive	2003-02-18	EC	France, Italy, Spain
101	JORDAN	Magnetic tapes	SG	Definitive	2002-05-01	EC	
102	JORDAN	Pasta	SG	Definitive	2003-02-18	EC	Italy
103	JORDAN	Sweetened biscuits	SG	Definitive	2001-09-01	EC	
104	KOREA	Pre-Sentized Printing Plate	AD	Definitive	2000-01-18	Netherlands	Netherlands
105	KOREA	Stainless Steel bars	AD	Definitive	2004-07-30	Spain	Spain
106	MALAYSIA	Self copy paper in rolls and sheets	AD	Definitive	1997-04-20	EC	
107	MEXICO	Bovine Meat	CVD	Definitive	1994-06-03	EC	Denmark
108	MEXICO	Crystal polystyrene	AD	Definitive	1999-09-23	EC	
109	MEXICO	Non-pregelatinized modified cationic potato starch	AD	Definitive	1992-05-25	Netherlands	Netherlands
110	MEXICO	Olive oil	CVD	Provisional	2004-06-10	EC	Spain, Italy
111	MEXICO	Parathion Methyl	AD	Definitive	2000-05-31	Denmark	Denmark
112	MEXICO	Sorbitol UPS grade	AD	Definitive	1990-09-27	France	France

113	MOLDOVA	Sugar	SG	Definitive	2004-01-01	EC	
114	MOROCCO	Bananas	SG	Definitive	2001-02-21	EC	
115	NEW ZEALAND	Canned peaches	CVD	Definitive	1998-01-09	EC	
116	NEW ZEALAND	Canned peaches	AD	Definitive	1998-03-09	Greece	Greece
117	PAKISTAN	Sorbitol 70% solution	AD	Definitive	2003-11-19	France	France
118	PERU	Olive oil	CVD	Definitive	2003-05-25	Czech Republic Greece Italy	Czech Republic Greece Italy
119	PERU	Textile products	CVD	Provisional	2004-10-13	Italy Spain	Italy Spain
120	PHILIPPINES	Ceramic floor and wall tiles	SG	Definitive	2002-04-11	EC	
121	PHILIPPINES	Figured glass	SG	Definitive	2003-10-13	EC	
122	PHILIPPINES	Float glass / Tinted Float glass	SG	Definitive	2003-10-13	EC	
123	PHILIPPINES	Glass Mirrors	SG	Definitive	2003-10-13	EC	
124	RUSSIA	Ball bearings and other taper roller bearings	SG	Definitive	2003-07-24	EC	Finland Germany
125	RUSSIA	Caramels	SG	Definitive	2002-01-25	EC	Denmark Italy Netherlands Spain UK
126	SOUTH AFRICA	Acetaminophenol	AD	Definitive	1999-06-18	France	France
127	SOUTH AFRICA	Cable supertension	AD	Definitive	2000-03-31	Germany	Germany
128	SOUTH AFRICA	Circuit breakers	AD	Definitive	1997-08-08	France Italy	France Italy

129	SOUTH AFRICA	PVC goods roll	AD	Definitive	2002-02-22	Germany Netherlands	Germany Netherlands
130	SOUTH AFRICA	Ropes & cables of iron or steel	AD	Definitive	2002-08-28	Germany UK	Germany UK
131	SOUTH AFRICA	Self-copy paper	AD	Definitive	2002-07-19	Belgium Germany UK	Belgium Germany UK
132	SOUTH AFRICA	Supertension cable	AD	Definitive	2000-03-31	Germany	Germany
133	SOUTH AFRICA	Suspension PVC	AD	Definitive	2002-10-18	France UK	France UK
134	SOUTH AFRICA	Sutures	AD	Definitive	2000-05-12	Germany	Germany
135	SOUTH AFRICA	Uncoated woodfree paper	AD	Definitive	1998-02-13	Poland Sweden	Poland Sweden
136	TAIPEI	H-Beam	AD	Definitive	1998-12-14	Poland	Poland
137	THAILAND	Flat cold-rolled stainless steel	AD	Definitive	2003-03-13	EC	Belgium Denmark Finland Italy Spain Sweden
138	THAILAND	Flat hot rolled in coils and not in coils	AD	Definitive	2003-05-27	Slovakia	Slovakia
139	THAILAND	H-sections	AD	Definitive	1997-05-26	Poland	Poland
140	TURKEY	Polyvinyl chloride (PVC)	AD	Definitive	2003-02-06	Belgium Finland Germany Greece Hungary Italy Netherlands	Belgium Finland Germany Greece Hungary Italy Netherlands
141	UKRAINE	Biscuits	SG	Definitive	2004-12-23	EC	

142	UKRAINE	Disposable syringes	SG	Definitive	2001-06-08	EC	Belgium Germany Ireland Spain
143	UKRAINE	Instant coffee	SG	Definitive	2003-03-01	EC	
144	USA	Aminoacetic acid	AD	Definitive	1970-03-24	France	France
145	USA	Antifriction bearings	AD	Definitive	1989-05-15	Italy, UK	Italy, UK
146	USA	Ball bearings	AD	Definitive	1989-05-15	France, Germany	France, Germany
147	USA	Brass sheet & strip	AD	Definitive	1987-03-06	France, Germany, Italy	France, Germany, Italy
148	USA	Brass sheet & strip	CVD	Definitive	1987-03-06	France	France
149	USA	Calcium aluminate cement and cement clinker	AD	Definitive	1994-06-13	France	France
150	USA	Carbon quality steel flat products	CVD	Definitive	1993-08-17	France	France
151	USA	Carbon steel flat products	CVD	Definitive	1993-08-17	Belgium, Germany	Belgium, Germany
152	USA	Chlorinated isocyanurates	AD	Provisional	2004-12-16	Spain	Spain
153	USA	Corrosion-resistant carbon steel flat products	AD	Definitive	1993-08-19	France, Germany	France, Germany
154	USA	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	CVD	Definitive	1993-07-09	UK	UK

155	USA	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	AD	Definitive	1993-08-19	Belgium, Finland, Germany, Poland, Spain, Sweden, UK	Belgium, Finland, Germany, Poland, Spain, Sweden, UK
156	USA	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	CVD	Definitive	1999-12-29	Italy	Italy
157	USA	Cut-to-length carbon steel plate	AD	Definitive	2000-02-10	France	France
158	USA	Cut-to-length carbon-quality steel plate	AD	Definitive	2000-02-10	Italy	Italy
159	USA	Eggs, whole dried	AD	Definitive	1970-09-18	Netherlands	Netherlands
160	USA	Glass heavy sheet	AD	Definitive	1971-12-09	France, Germany	France, Germany
161	USA	Grain-oriented silicon electrical steel	CVD	Definitive	1994-06-07	Italy	Italy
162	USA	Grain-oriented silicon electrical steel	AD	Definitive	1994-08-12	Italy	Italy
163	USA	Granular polytetrafluoroethylene resin	AD	Definitive	1988-08-30	Italy	Italy
164	USA	Hot rolled carbon steel flat products	AD	Definitive	2001-11-29	Netherlands	Netherlands
165	USA	Industrial belts	AD	Definitive	1989-06-14	Italy	Italy
166	USA	Industrial nitrocellulose	AD	Definitive	1983-08-10	France	France

167	USA	Industrial nitrocellulose	AD	Definitive	1990-07-10	Germany, UK	Germany, UK
168	USA	Low enriched uranium	AD	Definitive	2002-02-13	France	France
169	USA	Oil country tubular goods	CVD	Definitive	1995-08-10	Italy	Italy
170	USA	Oil country tubular goods	AD	Definitive	1995-08-11	Italy	Italy
171	USA	Pasta	AD	Definitive	1996-07-24	Italy	Italy
172	USA	Pasta	CVD	Definitive	1996-07-24	Italy	Italy
173	USA	Potassium chloride	AD	Definitive	1969-12-19	France, Germany	France, Germany
174	USA	Pressure sensitive plastic tape	AD	Definitive	1977-10-21	Italy	Italy
175	USA	Purified Carboxymethylcellulose (CMC)	AD	Provisional	2004-12-27	Finland, Netherlands, Sweden	Finland, Netherlands, Sweden
176	USA	Seamless line and pressure pipe	AD	Definitive	1995-08-03	Germany	Germany
177	USA	Small diameter seamless pipe	AD	Definitive	2000-08-14	Czech Republic	Czech Republic
178	USA	Sorbitol	AD	Definitive	1982-04-09	France	France
179	USA	Stainless steel angle	AD	Definitive	2001-05-18	Spain	Spain
180	USA	Stainless steel bar	AD	Definitive	1995-03-02	Spain	Spain
181	USA	Stainless steel bar	AD	Definitive	2002-03-07	France, Germany, Italy, UK	France, Germany, Italy, UK
182	USA	Stainless steel bar	CVD	Definitive	2002-03-08	Italy	Italy
183	USA	Stainless steel butt-weld pipe	AD	Definitive	2001-02-23	Italy	Italy

		fittings					
184	USA	Stainless steel plates in coils	CVD	Definitive	1999-05-11	Belgium, Italy	Belgium, Italy
185	USA	Stainless steel plates in coils	AD	Definitive	1999-05-21	Belgium, Italy	Belgium, Italy
186	USA	Stainless steel sheet and strip in coils	AD	Definitive	1999-07-27	France, Germany, Italy, UK	France, Germany, Italy, UK
187	USA	Stainless steel sheet and strip in coils	CVD	Definitive	1999-08-06	Italy	Italy
188	USA	Stainless steel wire rod	AD	Definitive	1994-01-28	France	France
189	USA	Stainless steel wire rod	AD	Definitive	1998-09-15	Italy, Spain, Sweden	Italy, Spain, Sweden
190	USA	Steel concrete reinforcing bars	AD	Definitive	2001-09-07	Latvia, Poland	Latvia, Poland
191	USA	Sugar	CVD	Definitive	1978-07-31	EC	
192	USA	Sugar	AD	Definitive	1979-06-13	Belgium, France, Germany	Belgium, France, Germany
193	USA	Sulphanilic Acid	AD	Definitive	2002-11-08	Hungary, Portugal	Hungary, Portugal
194	USA	Sulphanilic Acid	CVD	Definitive	2002-11-08	Hungary	Hungary
195	USA	Sulphur chemical (Sodium thiosulfate)	AD	Definitive	1991-02-19	Germany, UK	Germany, UK
196	USA	Transformers	AD	Definitive	1972-06-14	France	France
197	VENEZUELA	Blue-veined cheese	CVD	Definitive	1994-05-24	EC	Denmark, Netherlands

198	VENEZUELA	Paper and paperboard	SG	Definitive	2004-06-06	EC	
199	VENEZUELA	Potato starch	CVD	Definitive	2004-06-07	EC	